

**INDICTMENT
AGAINST
MONY**

2000-2010
Printed in 2011

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

"Men's lack of wisdom leads them to taste a liquor in which, deceived by the pleasant flavor, they do not discern the concealed poison."

Machiavelli

"If it were true that one still had to make impotent efforts to claim the rights of humanity, it would still be a duty to claim them."

Robespierre

"There is one thing more powerful than all the armies in the world, and that is an idea whose time has come."

Victor Hugo

"An idea that is not dangerous does not deserve to be called an idea."

Oscar Wilde

"Who cannot attack reasoning attacks the reasoner."

Paul Valéry

"Fear of ridicule brings out the worst in us. How many young people who thought they were full of valour have suddenly been deflated by the mere word "utopia" applied to their convictions, and the fear of being seen as chimerical in the eyes of sensible people. As if all the great progress of mankind wasn't due to utopia realized!"

André Gide

Evidence can be understood naturally or demonstrated laboriously.

Philippe Landeux

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

PHILIPPE LANDEUX

**INDICTMENT
AGAINST
MONY**

OR

EQUALITY THEORY

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

INDICTMENT
against
MONY

PUBLIC ACCUSER: Philippe Landeux

1st JUROR: Mr. Blind
2nd JUROR: Mr. Cupid
3rd JUROR: Mr. Neuron
4th JUROR: Mr. Glutton
5th JUROR: Mrs. Hell
6th JUROR: Mrs. Shortsighted
7th JUROR: Mrs. Weathervane

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Citizens, esteemed jurors,

Today, you are gathered here to constitute the tribunal of public opinion and judge a monster altered by the sweat, blood, and tears of men whom it has held under its yoke for millennia. But you must surely be surprised that there is no one in the defendant's dock. Don't expect it! It will not come; it is already here; it is everywhere; it is nowhere. It is impossible for it to appear in the flesh for the simple reason that it is not human.

For the first time in history, humanity, represented by you, is called upon to pass judgment on a "convention" or rather a belief that nothing has ever shaken and has become so powerful that men have become its playthings, and the world its prey. Mony, behold the monster!

No, citizens! You have not been invited to a farce but to the most prodigious action that can be accomplished. It is not about committing the insane act of judging an inanimate object, such as a gold ingot, or ruling on an opinion, such as everyone may have about wealth or poverty, but to understand what Mony truly is, to appreciate the true measure of its role, to know its relationships with Man, to define the position that Humanity must adopt in the face of it, and to determine its fate and ours.

What appears to be a settled matter is far from it! Not only does no one—with a few exceptions—see Mony as an enemy, but everyone seems to deny its influence on our lives, almost to the point of dismissing it altogether.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Despite its overwhelming impact on "Society," being the subject of all discussions and at the heart of all problems, it is exonerated even before its role and nature have been seriously examined.

But, esteemed jurors, why couldn't Mony be presumed guilty? Because it is invisible? Because it does not exist as a person? Yet, when a storm uproots a tree that crashes onto a house, we do not accuse the uprooted tree, the damaged house, the gardener, or the architect... but the wind! No one sees it, no one can handcuff it, but that doesn't prevent us from conceiving it and rightfully accusing it! The nature of the wind was long a mystery, but its effects—the swirling dust, the rustling leaves, the passing clouds, etc.—suffice to prove to people its existence. It should be the same with Mony, although, unlike the wind, Mony is within our power. But that is precisely what diverts our attention from it! Mony is within our power. Is it truly so, or are we within its power?

Certainly, Mony is not an individual. Yet, what are the characteristics of a person? Is it the fact of being mortal? Mony had a beginning. It is therefore not eternal and will have an end. Is it the fact of having limbs? All institutions, organizations, and businesses whose sole vocation is financial can easily be likened to the arms through which the will of Mony is accomplished. Is it the fact of having a circulatory system? Monetary units circulate in the social body like blood flow in an animal body. Is it the fact of having an appetite? Mony infiltrates everywhere and devours everything. Is it the fact of exerting moral influence? Many are obsessed with getting rich and are willing to do anything to achieve it; many others are in misery or burdened with troubles because of the relentless financial logic; still others, rarer, shun wealth like the plague. No one escapes Mony. In whatever form, its influence is evident everywhere and on everyone. Is it the fact of having authority? The laws of Mony, the famous financial constraints, have absolute rule over men and their own laws. Is it the fact of thinking? If so, few men are persons! Is it the fact of having logic? Capitalo-liberalism is its faithful and most submissive interpreter. Is it the fact of having allies? This trial shows how many it has! All men defend it with passion, and most without reason. Is it the fact of being able to defend itself? Its satellites hold all the powers. Is it the fact of being autonomous? No one controls it. And the more we deny its power, the more it

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

is immune to criticism and attacks, the more freedoms it has, the more its empire expands, the more its power strengthens, and the more it abuses it at our expense. In truth, citizens, men have never truly resisted it! How could they trouble it when they damn themselves for it, for the slightest of its favors?

Invisible, omnipresent, Mony is nevertheless different from a man. But how is it different from a God? If the answer to the question of the existence of a God is a matter of faith, the question of the existence of Mony calls for only one answer: it exists. Would not atheists judge God cruel and guilty of the miseries of this world if they believed in him? And do not believers affirm his existence without ever having seen him? Yet atheists cannot doubt the existence of Mony, which, as currency, moves in pockets, nor can believers reject the inconceivable idea— in the case of God for atheists— that an invisible thing is active and powerful! Believers attribute wonders to their God that they sense... but there is nothing to sense regarding Mony; one only needs to open their eyes to see its seal prominently stamped on all scourges.

"Mony makes the world go round," "Mony drives people mad," "Mony corrupts everything," "Mony is the sinews of war," "Mony is king." These expressions that everyone has used at some point are expressions of common sense. Does this same common sense not compel us to admit what it has observed? We cannot deny what we have recognized forever! Do these expressions not clearly say that Mony holds the world in its hand, not to mention under its boot? And if Mony holds the world in its grip, if everything revolves around it, everything inevitably settles on it, everything acts or reacts in relation to it, under its watch. Thus, there are few human actions that are not directly or indirectly motivated by Mony. And actions motivated by Mony do they not mean that Mony motivates our actions? How can Mony motivate without being, and how could it be without motivating?

Mony is neither man nor God; it is a monstrous entity! If it is impossible to judge God, if it is possible to condemn a man, what about Mony, which is neither one nor the other? Because, esteemed jurors, it is not just a matter of expressing an opinion or rehashing prejudices for us, but within the confines of this tribunal, reaching a verdict. We must first determine if Mony can be judged by the "Society" we represent. The tribunal of public opinion has the

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

power to rule only on matters that concern humans as members of the City, which, by harming even a single Citizen, infringe upon all Citizens; in short, it can only pronounce on objects that, directly or indirectly, affect us all. Mony fits perfectly within the scope of our jurisdiction, and nothing fits better!

However, a judgment implies the possibility of a conviction, and a conviction against Mony would imply that Mony bears it alone. It is precisely this implication that has always shielded Mony from any suspicion. How can one take action against something without substance and that seems nonexistent? If it has no existence, if it seems inaccessible, it becomes absurd to pursue it, and even more so to strike it! But if it exists and does harm without us pursuing it, without us even thinking of pursuing it, its power will become all the more formidable as it will have, with our cooperation, ensured impunity and chained our minds! However, Mony is a pure product of the human mind. It is there, in our heads, in our minds, that its unshakeable seat, its impregnable stronghold, lies. Mony is in us, despite us, and each, unwittingly, lends it their skull as a refuge and their body as a shield. In short, each of us is an accomplice.

At least we now know where its lair is. This should prevent us from exonerating it from its responsibilities and exclusively blaming men. But how unjust would we still be! Recognizing men's share of guilt, would it not be to deny the irresistible influence of Mony? Can we compare the insignificance of men to the superhuman power of Mony and accuse them of weakness when they cannot compete with it? Is it its fault if the insect perishes crushed under the elephant's paw? Similarly, the weight of Mony crushes men to the point that, in one way or another, everyone accepts its domination. Until this hour, did defying it not seem like madness to you? Was your submission not so total that you never considered it a monster? Even at this very moment, do you not think that Mony, whatever is said about it, will always be and that it is vain to concern ourselves with it? Yet, esteemed jurors, the relationship between Man and Mony is not comparable to that between the insect and the elephant! Nature has made the insect and the elephant two distinct beings and established between them an eternal power relationship. On the other hand, it is Man who, so to speak, has made Mony, who has given it existence. Mony lives only thanks to Man. Therefore, Man has the power of life and

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

death over Mony. Mony, in turn, has power over Man only as conferred by its nature. Man and Mony are thus connected, but unlike the insect and the elephant, each has power over the other, provided it is exercised. But how can Man adore or despise Mony and at the same time reject it? Man does not exercise his power, and Mony exercises its own without restraint! The "creator" has thus become the prey of his creation, like an unconscious person ends up being devoured by the beast he raised. In fact, Man is a prisoner of monetary logic. Everything now has a price. Nothing escapes Mony! Whether we gain or lose, whether we spend or save, whether we act or react, everything is translated into a greater or lesser cost, everything is posed, directly or indirectly, in financial terms: nothing escapes the dictate of Mony!

Yet Mony is a fiction. It is nothing without Man. It harms him, it can even destroy him, but it cannot survive him. On the other hand, Man can, if he wants, annihilate it and survive, but he cannot both preserve it and free himself from it. Mony is indeed as powerful as it would be easy for Man to bring it down. It was brought into the world by Man; it can receive the fatal blow from him! The entire question for us is whether Man should deliver this blow.

Without going so far as to consider Mony as we present it to this tribunal — and we will expose it, stripped of all its artifices — some men have nonetheless already suspected it and still suspect it of being involved in numerous misdeeds.

Some hope to weaken it. But it is powerful as soon as it exists because it exists to be powerful! In fact, they do not know what Mony is. They believe that it would be enough for men to pay it no attention for its power to vanish, and for it to disappear on its own. In short, they preach contempt for Mony. Moreover, because they despise it, they refrain from questioning its deep nature and the consequences of their "doctrines." They also ignore the real reason why Mony must be fought and adopt, without a specific goal, without a social perspective, means that can in no way annihilate its destructive effects. In fact, they practice the ostrich's policy. According to some, the solution is to advocate for free goods, donations, volunteering, to show generosity, to redistribute wealth, to overthrow, or even to flee the "consumer society," etc.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

But how do the Good Samaritans, Robin Hoods, and Robinson Crusoes threaten the system that most people, for lack of a better option, do not want to leave? Moreover, do they themselves exit the system, do they really challenge it? No, since it is primarily behaviors they want to change.

Marginals have always existed... and Mony still exists. This is enough to say that their attitude and ideas do not affect it. Why? Because they generally make two mistakes: they believe that all men are or should be capable of showing as much moral strength as themselves, and are also convinced that frugality is a weapon against the "system," that is, fundamentally, against Mony. Their first mistake ruins the hopes they foolishly attach to the second. Indeed, it is not in the nature of men to sustain a big effort indefinitely and endure artificial deprivation for a long time. Frugality, which requires a lot of willpower, can be a weapon only if all "Citizens" agree to restrict themselves and if this voluntary restriction is temporary, in other words, if frugality quickly fulfills its promises, which it cannot in this case. Because it is not a new conception of social order and therefore cannot deeply disrupt the system. This policy, which is not a policy and, to be implemented, would require an improbable mobilization, would never achieve the long-awaited revolution and would condemn "Citizens" to eternal and useless deprivation. But these, disappointed by this failure, irritated at having been deceived once again by false prophets, hungry after this period of deprivation, would quickly return to their habits, despite the rantings of the fanatics.

Moreover, marginality, by definition, does not suit the majority, which reluctantly endorses the system that the marginals themselves do not threaten since they neglect Mony or only see it as a means of exchange, as currency. So, marginals have two options, both equally bad: keep the currency and Mony or eliminate currency and all means of exchange. Needless to say, in the first case, whether the currency is retained as it is or in another form¹, Mony continues to reign with the disastrous consequences that implies, and in the second case, due to the lack of (revolutionary) means of exchange conveying a new conception of exchange and Society and satisfying the current economic need that currency satisfies in its way, the

1 Those who want to preserve the currency while acknowledging some of its flaws generally consider nothing more than a modification of its operation, such as combating hoarding. This is how the theory of Distributive Economics suggests, under the name of credits, monetary units that would not circulate (see note 30).

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

elimination of all means of exchange would leave a void that men, still prisoners of monetary logic, would quickly fill in the only conceivable way for them, namely by adopting a new currency. It would be back to square one. These ideas and their variants lead to nothing.

No, citizens, it is not by making an effort on ourselves that we will disturb Mony that lurks around us (in its material form). This reflex has been tested for centuries without ever yielding results. Its zealots should acknowledge this and conclude that they are going astray. Alas! Men rarely admit their mistakes and are so proud that they attribute all the faults to themselves! While they claim to overthrow the empire of Mony, they find none of its faults. How could it have any, since it is (supposedly) an "invention" of men, everyone knows that they are incapable of making a mistake or committing a misstep? Like true philosophers, these thinkers have found neither the answers nor the questions, and far from enlightening Man, they deliver him to Mony, without even knowing it! Thus, without being praised, Mony is ignored, protected, and invincible! It is the winner by default!

In essence, men have never tried anything serious against Mony, but they adamantly believe they have tried everything, which reinforces the idea that Mony is invulnerable. Universally considered invulnerable, it becomes unthinkable to confront it, and no one considers such an enterprise. Mony is therefore not the subject of any dispute, and to justify this resignation, pride commands men to deny even its influence on them, to hear without flinching the most obvious falsehoods, to persist in paths notoriously leading to dead ends – in short, to obscure Mony, which is nonetheless at the center of their world and (consciously or not) all their concerns. The veil they cast over the monstrous nature of Mony is so thick that men are not even suspected of bad faith when they claim its innocence! How could they see in the object of all their dreams, in the master of all their thoughts, the instrument of all their miseries? Victims of their illusions, slaves to their certainties, men still revolt against the rare enlightened individuals who, overcoming all prejudices, dare to defy it. Thus, to Mony's intrinsic power is added the energetic servility of men.

However, if they exonerate Mony, men are nevertheless in search of a culprit who, if not below or above them, can only be among them. Thus, they offer

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mony the delightful spectacle of their divisions! They quarrel endlessly to attract the favors of the one who divides them and rules over them. In this context, many men, even more than the first type of rebels – the marginals mentioned earlier – have chosen to attack the privileged, thus never threatening the despot. However, the status of privileged clearly indicates that they themselves have a master from whom they derive their privileges! There is no nobility without a king, just as there is no monarchy without aristocrats! Now, who is ignorant that these privileged owe everything to Mony, the king, and that, as long as Mony exists, there will be privileged of fortune, an aristocracy of Mony? Why attack them rather than Mony itself?

We can see, citizens, that rebels of this second kind desperately make the same mistake as the first! All want to fight effects without going back to their cause. All see the weaknesses of Man, none see the power of Mony. All make men their target, whether they target themselves or others. It is so much easier to bring down or blame a man than to attack Mony! But tormenting a false innocent does not make him a true culprit, and sparing a culprit is a crime against innocence. Thus, men, never having considered Mony's guilt, have always hunted for culprits within themselves and have ended up finding one in every man. Conclusion: Man is inherently bad. However, citizens, it is impossible to exclude another hypothesis: Man is bad in reaction; something makes him bad, worse than nature, if he is naturally so. Not knowing or not wanting to know where evil comes from, we have assumed it is innate. But can the men of the 21st century still hear this language without reacting? Does science not confirm what logic demonstrates, namely that nothing is lost, everything is transformed; that every effect has a cause, and every cause is itself an effect? Is it possible to deny the acts to which Mony pushes men? Would Mony then be at the center of our problems without being the cause, without having any part in them? It would be the only parameter that does not influence men while being more omnipresent in their lives than any other! Its effects, as manifest as they are, would not be attributed to it because it is inconceivable that Mony is a cause, that of our miseries! Yet, this fallacy is considered undeniable by men and to which they cling with all their might. Try to shake such reasoning! It supports everything and its opposite! The Truth that insults their ego is, for them, a heinous lie! But as

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

they cannot shake it or admit it, they take refuge in flight or uproar, deafness or escalation!

Citizens, your faces reveal the unease you feel! You are men and have shared their mistakes. But this trial is not yours! Do not confuse error and crime, martyr and executioner, Man and Mony! You are not frightened defendants; you are imperturbable judges. Forget your past mistakes and be Citizens worthy of humanity's trust! Aware of having been weak, you are now stronger! Silence the pride that seeks to alter your judgment to prolong the times of carefree servitude! Ignorance is a legitimate excuse that knowledge no longer has, and your past mistakes, if you still make them, will henceforth be crimes! Mony ruled despite us; it would reign thanks to you!

Banish from your minds the terrors that Mony inspires in you! Do not let anxiety paralyze you! For everything paralyzes you, and more than anything: the firm belief that Mony is irreplaceable!! You say to yourselves, "What's the use of denouncing it if it is irreplaceable?" And, as you do not denounce it, it seems to be so indeed! Yet, you have never seriously thought about the question. You must break this infernal cycle today! The mind can triumph over everything, even over what seems a priori impossible!! We do not challenge the laws of nature! We are only examining an element inadvertently engendered by Man and perpetuated by the force of circumstances and the prejudices he himself has aroused. Because, as we will show, Mony has not been thought; it has always escaped us. Is it the fact of having to think today about an essential parameter of "Society" that troubles you so much? Do the consequences of this parameter not deserve this effort, especially when we know that all efforts to ward off Mony's despotism without attacking Mony itself have been in vain and would continue to be so? It is time to stop struggling to fight at last!

Moreover, citizens, remember that you are here to judge Mony, not to find a successor for it in case you decide against it. We must essentially determine what it is and what it is potentially guilty of. Because, how can we envisage its condemnation without being, beforehand, convinced of its misdeeds? It is this conviction that we must forge; it is on this aspect of things that you must concentrate. Of course, no warning can distract you from the concerns that centuries of habit and dependence on Mony will raise in the face of the

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

prospects that this trial will open and the transformations it could bring! These concerns are proof of the place Mony occupies. However, by thinking about the void it could leave and the influences – even if denied – it could no longer exert, you risk stepping back and failing in your mission of public salvation. Everyone knows, however, that nature abhors a vacuum.

It is also while trying to imagine what could fill this void that you envision unrealistic or terrifying solutions in a flash and promptly throw out the baby with the bathwater. How could you judiciously conceive a replacement for Mony without exactly knowing why it should be replaced? By proceeding in this way, you skip steps and imagine the worst, while the worst is right in front of you! Let incredulity and enthusiasm give way to reason! When force cannot subdue you, it is the unconscious or misused exercise of your freedom that leads you astray! Beware, you are your own worst enemies... after Mony!

Citizen jurors, during this unique and solemn trial that will astonish future generations, who will not understand why judging this intangible monster required superhuman selflessness and heroic will, why such an obvious truth needed an incredible and passionate controversy, you will have the opportunity to intervene. This unprecedented trial must awaken consciences and spark a revolt of humankind. This judgment must be the founding act of a new era. Each of you has the right, and even the duty, to leave no shadow remaining. Forget your weaknesses and rise to the height of your mission. Humanity commands firmness; to weaken would be to betray it, and to betray it would be our eternal dishonor!

Mony is at our mercy; it is up to you to decide!

Mr. Blind: Mr. Prosecutor, since we are allowed to intervene, allow me to point out that it would be better to talk about concrete things, about everyday problems that require urgent answers!

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Citizen, you want something concrete instead of a dissertation on Mony! Well! Does this mean that Mony is never involved in the concrete problems we face every day, and that by dealing with it, we are just making noise? You say: It would be better... better than what? Are you recommending mimicking the policies that wave problems in front of us and constantly promise improvements without anything ever getting better? Is that what we should do in our turn? We are not trying to be original, but why persist in a dead-end path where, for centuries, people have been jostling? If this path had an exit, why would we still be looking for it after so long? And how could we find the solution by taking the same path, with the same reflexes and the same discourse as our predecessors? Do you think that approaching a problem differently is a sign of indifference? Supporting a new method against general opinion is rather a sign of immense determination and a real desire to end the ills of 'Society'?

Should we only talk about problems or try to solve them? Is it by lamenting the suffering of a patient and providing him with superficial and perpetually temporary care that a doctor discovers the medicine that cures the disease forever? What do you think we are pursuing ourselves? It is true that we do not isolate problems to try to treat them on a case-by-case basis, that we do not succumb to the impatience trend... But what results have the methods you would like to see us apply yielded? On the other hand, showing — as we are about to do — that Mony is the source of most problems, would that not be a step towards a solution? Separating each domain and neglecting the Mony trail, would that not be moving away from it? How can we solve a particular problem whose cause is not specific to it? How can we even hope to solve it one day, since this classic method consists of or leads to hiding its deep-seated cause, adapting to it, and trying only to mitigate or contain its effects?

Beware, citizens! Walking without ever looking up does not get you far, and moving forward while looking into the distance without anticipating obstacles leads nowhere! Yes, there are urgent problems that have needed to be addressed for millennia! Will we continue to advocate for emergency intervention and punctual action forever? The monetary 'Society' has

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

problems that form a whole that we must consider from a social perspective! Until we are able to rid 'Society' of Mony, let us certainly extend a hand, but let us not lose our heads!

Mrs Hell : It is too easy, Mr. Prosecutor, to make Mony a scapegoat, to blame it for all the ills of the Earth!

Citizen, the question is not whether the thing is easy but whether it is legitimate. Moreover, it is not our intention to make Mony a scapegoat, but to formally acknowledge its guilt in the ills that afflict "Society," the "Citizens," and therefore humanity in certain respects. On your part, citizen, what do you mean by a scapegoat? A scapegoat is a wrongly accused culprit designated by the crowd or highlighted by the real culprits. Do you mean to say that we are accusing it wrongly, that Mony is not guilty of everything, and therefore guilty of nothing? However, even if we were accusing it unjustly, can we reasonably have nothing to reproach it for? However minimal its guilt, on what grounds refuse to examine it? Your attitude, citizen, can only divert our attention from Mony and, once again, burden humanity.

As for saying that accusing Mony and therefore attacking it is easy, that is advancing quite lightly! Should we understand that you turn away from Mony as if it were too easy prey? Are you capable of sweeping it away with a single breath, as if by accident! So, it's the ease that repels you! However, if there is an undeniable trait in humans, it is precisely the tendency to seek ease. How do you explain then that everyone proposes to change things according to increasingly delirious strategies, but no one attacks Mony head-on, that no one dares even to name it, and that everyone, on the contrary, does everything possible to avoid this fight? If Mony were as weak and insignificant as you imply, be sure, citizen, that it would be dead already! Since it is still here after millennia, since it is supposedly too easy to go after it, one must believe that people, for once, seek difficulty... unless Mony is tougher than you claim, that it is so vast that you can't see it, and so powerful that it is

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

easier to ignore it than to defy it! However, at a time when it clearly dominates the world, refusing to accuse it on the pretext that it is too easy to go after it attests to its strength and your cowardice! It surpasses us and crushes you! To stand against it, one must overcome one's own prejudices, plunge into the unknown, unravel a thousand mysteries, and be resigned to seeing the world stand against oneself, as you have just done! That is what you find easy! Yet these are the most difficult trials that a person can face! How convenient it is then to give up on these trials by accusing those who are willing to endure them of taking the easy way out! For most people, attacking it is inconceivable, and with a twist, you make it seem as if it is the most obvious thing to consider and undertake! Did you really expect that this sophism would impress anyone other than you and your ilk?

It is, however, true that Mony would be easy to bring down (or rather, to annihilate) if people did not, in fact, band together to support it. Because, as much as it owes its life today to their blindness and cowardice, its death depends on their will. But until humanity gives it a taste of its own medicine, it will remain the most formidable enemy.

Mrs. Shortsighted : But, Mr. Prosecutor, Mony is the means of exchange that humans need, you said so yourself!

No, citizen! Mony is not the means of exchange we need, but we need a means of exchange! The fact that we do not conceive of another does not mean that Mony, more precisely currency, is the only possibility. At the height of their intellectual development, humans do not envision any alternative to currency other than a return to barter, which everyone knows is perfectly unrealistic, as barter is not a means of exchange but a mode of exchange. Chained by capitalist prejudices, they always return to currency, accepting and even ignoring its vices. It is, however, unquestionable that imaginative

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

efforts—which humans are certainly capable of—would be successful. And it is precisely for the purpose of freeing their logical and inventive minds that we are gathered here.

Before we continue, citizens, we must finally understand what Mony is and where it comes from. We have, on several occasions, distinguished currency from Mony. This distinction is essential. All academic or popular terms used to evoke Mony have always exclusively referred to currency or are related to it. There are, therefore, many words to translate the same concept: the unit of value or monetary units; there was still none to designate what we call Mony here. Mony is not currency but its reason for being, its principle, its source, its root. **MONY IS THE BELIEF THAT THE NOTION OF (MARKET) VALUE IS NECESSARY FOR EXCHANGE.** There would be no currency; it would be useless; it would make no sense if people engaged in a form of exchange not based on the notion of value. Conversely, people cannot break free from this system of exchange, from the monetary system, until they realize that it rests solely on their belief that the notion of market value is necessary for exchange, in a word, on Mony². But how could they break free when they did not have a word to think about it judiciously? They could only imagine variations of it and repeatedly return to the monetary system as it is because it is as it must be due to the origin of the very notion of market value.

That said, now that we have established this distinction, now that we know that Mony is not currency, we will nevertheless, for reasons of simplicity or efficiency, sometimes use the term Mony to refer to currency. It will indeed sometimes be a question of Mony in the broad sense, that is, Mony and its consequences, with currency being one among others. This use will not be fundamentally improper, although it would be perilous in the long run without the distinction we have made. On the other hand, we will never use Mony, at least without clarification, to refer to the means of exchange of the monetary system, that is, currency alone.

So, where does Mony come from? From the practice of barter. However, barter, as the ordinary mode of exchange among members of a "Society," did not always exist. Before being able to barter, before having something to

² This belief is so ingrained that, when confronted with the definition of Mony, they argue that the concept of value is a necessity, not a belief. However, this notion is indeed a concept, an idea that only exists in their minds. Therefore, it is a belief.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

barter, people lived in communities. Each fulfilled their task, either alone or with others, and the collective product was distributed among the members of the social body. There was no barter because no one possessed anything extraordinary or anything that could not be found in nature or manufactured without genius; there was nothing to barter. The arts³ had to progress, and people had to start producing rare and indivisible objects for barter to appear. Then there was no alternative but direct exchange between individuals. As the "artists" could not simultaneously dedicate themselves to their art and the quest for food, having to live from their art, they had no choice but to either give away their production (but to whom? on what grounds?) in exchange for a share of the collective product or exchange it with another individual for a share of the product of their personal efforts. The first solution being impractical, one can guess that the second quickly prevailed. By doing so, the artists created new needs, needs that everyone wanted to satisfy. But to be able to exchange with them, everyone had to possess something particular, which is not the case when people work together, for example, when they hunt or fish in a group. So, everyone started working on their own. The artists then exchanged their products with the highest bidder (because why lose in exchange when you can gain?). Now that everyone was working for themselves, barter became possible between all Citizens who became simple neighbors, and, over time, its practice became common, although individuals, by withdrawing into themselves, were autonomous, or almost, and rarely needed to exchange ⁴.

We will develop the antisocial consequences of barter. But before that, let us note that it was not by calculation that people adopted this practice, but because they had no other option. It is through the practice of barter, by exchanging one or more objects for one or more other objects, a quantity of something for a quantity of something else, by establishing "equivalences,"

3 Until the 18th century, the term 'arts' referred not only to artistic abilities but also to technical, medical, and other forms of knowledge.

4 All of this is somewhat caricatural from a historical perspective but helps understand the origin of the notion of value and, consequently, the origin of the medium of exchange that is money. In fact, the evolution of techniques and the need for barter were probably less the cause of individuals' isolation within the group than the emergence of livestock breeding and agriculture. However, these two developments spanned millennia. Barter only slowly became a common practice (in the sense of a normal mode of exchange) and was never a widespread practice within 'Society' (in the sense that individuals, almost autonomous, had little need to exchange). Nevertheless, this was sufficient for people to conceive the notion of value (and ultimately money). Another phenomenon also contributed to this: exchanges between groups, which, like between individuals and for the same reasons, were also conducted through barter.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

that the notion of value (market value) also appeared⁵. Exchanges between individuals, therefore, rely on what we call Mony here. But we can see that humans did not conceive Mony to be the foundation of their exchange system, nor did they imagine that it would arise from the exchange system that circumstances forced them to adopt. They conceived it so little that they still do not know what it is!

Once the practice of barter was in place, it, like everything else, underwent evolution. What we call barter, that is, the direct exchange between two individuals of a possessed object for a desired object, is purely theoretical as an exchange system. In practice, it is rare for an individual to possess exactly what the other desires. Consequently, for there to be an exchange between two individuals, it is necessary for at least one of the two to acquire, in advance, through an exchange with a third party, what they can later exchange with the other. In short, barter, which is theoretically a direct exchange system, is, in reality, a system where indirect exchange is

⁵ In his discourse on the origin and foundations of inequality among men, Jean-Jacques Rousseau makes three fundamental errors.

Firstly, he assumes that primitive men were solitary, whereas all indications suggest that humans were inherently social beings from the beginning, similar to many animals. Therefore, they could not have discovered the principles of political association that govern all societies, both human and animal. Moreover, Rousseau attributes to the rich the initiative to form 'societies' for their benefit. 'Such was, or had to be, the origin of society and laws, which imposed new restraints on the weak and provided new strength to the rich, irreversibly destroying natural freedom, permanently establishing the law of property and inequality, turning skillful usurpation into an irrevocable right, and subjecting the entire human race to labor, servitude, and misery for the benefit of a few ambitious individuals.' Rousseau is forced to reason in this way because he assumes that primitive men were solitary. However, he has established that, under such conditions, they would be crude and of equivalent strength. Yet, among men without connections and without any reason to have them, incapable of evolving in any field, how could some become rich? There can be no rich, in any sense of the term, without a pre-existing society. It is because men lived in society that they could evolve to the point of annihilating society itself, which some took advantage of. In short, by denying that society existed before what he calls society, and which is no longer one, Rousseau put the cart before the horse.

Secondly, although he perceives the interdependence that arises among men due to the evolution of their creative capacities, he neglects its immediate consequence: the emergence of a new mode of exchange—barter. Consequently, and this is his third error, he overlooks the social, or rather antisocial, consequences of barter and money. Thus, he writes: 'As soon as men were needed to smelt and forge iron, other men were needed to feed them. The more the number of workers multiplied, the fewer hands were employed to provide for the common subsistence, without there being fewer mouths to consume it; and as some needed commodities in exchange for their iron, others finally discovered the secret of using iron to multiply commodities. Hence, on one hand, came plowing and agriculture, and on the other, the art of working metals and multiplying their uses.' Rousseau so little considers that inequality (in rights) is linked to money (let alone speaking of 'Mony') that, of all the evolutions and revolutions that humans underwent, the change in the mode of exchange, although crucial, is the only one he does not consider for a moment. That the laws of Mony obliterate the principles of political association, and that one should not look any further for the cause of inequality, has completely escaped him.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

practically universal. Now, when there is indirect exchange, the object obtained from the third person by the first person and then exchanged with the second person serves (for the first person) as a means of exchange.

Over time, people realized that some goods, initially desired for themselves, frequently played the role of a means of exchange, and soon they discovered that some of these means of exchange were more practical than others. Soon, they only made exchanges through these⁶. The concept of a means of

⁶ In his book "Aux origines de la monnaie" (On the Origins of Money), Alain Testart argues that "primitive money does not serve as a medium of exchange." Making a distinction between paying and buying, he sees these monies as means of payment rather than exchange, or at least he considers that they become means of exchange only because they are initially accepted as pure means of payment, i.e., against nothing (for example, in the context of offerings). However, if a means of exchange is indeed a means of payment, is a means of payment that is not a means of exchange still a form of money, even if primitive? Can one still speak of payment without successively abusing the terms means and payment? No. Because it is not enough for an individual to transfer an object to another for that object to be called a means. Any good can be seized, transferred, or used without being a means. For the subject at hand, a means should be understood as a good having a function, regardless of its nature, and being desired or used because of this function. It is also not sufficient for an individual to give something to another to say that the first one pays the second. The act of giving something (voluntarily or for lack of choice) or being stolen (under any name) has nothing to do with the act of payment, even if the thing in question is money. To speak of payment, there must obviously be a transfer of money or a good that can be considered as such, but there must also be an exchange.

Mr. Testart makes three serious errors: 1) He sometimes presents examples of payment in which there is no payment because the concerned good, being desired for itself, does not actually function as money. 2) He sees only payments where there are also exchanges. Because money, in all cases, is used to acquire or obtain rights (the reason is too complex to be developed here): the right to property, the right to use, the right to kill (in the case of wergeld), the right to passage, the right to park, etc. (By extension, it also allows someone to strip someone else of these same rights.) We speak of buying, exchanging when money is used to acquire a material thing (goods or people). Still, if the term "buying" is sometimes inappropriate for obtaining a right, a payment is also always an exchange. It doesn't matter whether the money is paid before or after obtaining this right, whether the enjoyment or exercise of this right is anticipated, instantaneous, or deferred relative to the payment. That is why a fine is a payment, not, as Mr. Testart believes, because there is no exchange but because money is paid for a usurped right, which paradoxically gives those who can pay this fine the right to break the law. 3) He links the concept of money to those of debt and credit. However, since humans are social by nature, they inevitably have relationships with each other, and there is no need to be in a monetary system to be indebted to someone, just as a debt settled with a good does not make that good money. We say we pay our debts because we generally settle our debts with money (note in passing that money serves here as a means of exchange and not as pure payment), but outside the monetary framework, these terms are improper and fallacious.

So the whole question is what money is and when it is possible and correct to speak of primitive money.

First of all, it should be noted that modern money is a standard unit desired for its function as money. Primitive money, on the other hand, is necessarily a common good that can also be desired for itself, for its nature. The same good is not money in all cases of use. For it to be one, it must be acquired to be ceded, as this circulation shows that it is not desired for itself by the intermediate acquirer but only for its function. Secondly, modern money is a standard of market value. Primitive money, being the origin of modern money, must itself be a standard of value or at least serve to determine the value of things in relation to it. It is necessary to see in the use of a good a standard of market value, even if it may not be perceived as such by those involved, to say that it is (in the context of that use) a form of money. If every good has a certain value or presents a certain interest, the concept of market value can only arise from barter, from the exchange of concrete objects (between individuals of the same group or different groups, or between groups), because it is through the equivalence of objects that it becomes possible to conceive this form of value expressed in the quantity of another object. Confusing value or interest with market value, Mr. Testart speaks of a means of payment, and thus money, in

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

exchange naturally emerged from the practice of barter, and it is also natural that various means of exchange were selected. These initial goods (stones, shells, jewelry, etc.) serving as a means of exchange were called primitive currencies. The money as we know it today was merely the standardization by states or powerful individuals of one or more of these means of exchange. Sometimes they standardized primitive currencies; sometimes they adopted a new monetary support (iron, copper, silver, gold, etc.), but in no case did they invent the very concept of money, in the sense of a means of exchange. So,

cases where there is truly no exchange. But what is the market value of a good that changes hands without a counterpart? The concept of market value and the need for a "reliable" standard of value cannot arise from this kind of practice; it cannot even arise from the exchange of goods for a service. Therefore, it is wrongly asserted that, in these cases, Mr. Testart, like others before him, speaks of means of payment and primitive monies concerning the goods used.

Finally, as we have already mentioned, it is not enough for a good to change hands or even be exchanged to make it money. Humans have the ability to produce and exchange. But we must not confuse the mode of exchange with the system of exchange, the object of exchange with the means of exchange, the means of exchange with money. There can be a mode of exchange without money (as in barter, although the principle of money is contained in indirect barter) and a non-monetary means of exchange (although this case has not yet occurred in history, but history is not over). When a good is involved in an exchange, without being money, it is nothing more than an object of exchange. Normal barter involves two objects of exchange. Indirect barter involves three objects of exchange, one of which serves as a means of exchange. Monetary exchange involves money and an object of exchange. Therefore, one should not, like Mr. Testart, seek to see the seed of money whenever goods (which by definition constitute wealth, even for people who do not conceive market value) change hands. Any good can occasionally serve as a means of exchange, an intermediary between two exchanges, but, except for modern money, a good is not money in itself: it is its use before and/or after a given exchange that makes it a primitive money or turns it into one.

For Mr. Testart, "Money is the type of good that is preferred or prescribed [by the State or custom] in payments. [...] This good will therefore not be refused [by others], not only for a question of right, because it is forbidden to refuse it but also for an obvious economic reason: the one who acquires it can also use it to pay, so it is advantageous to have it. [...] If it is able to serve as a means of payment, it will also serve as a means of exchange." (p. 29) But this reasoning ultimately relies on the pre-existing existence of money when the whole question is precisely how money appears.

Mr. Testart's idea that a good becomes money and a means of exchange because a powerful figure, an institution, or a custom demands it in pure payment (tax, offering) is more than fragile. To begin with, he does not take sufficient account of the conditions specific to primitive societies in which all individuals live in the same way, produce and possess roughly the same things. Even by Mr. Testart's own admission, barter within these societies is infrequent. "In societies without a division of labor, exchanges can only concern products that we would say today are 'international'" (p. 42) So what does the so-called payment he talks about consist of (assuming it is indeed a pure payment and not an exchange, which would immediately ruin Mr. Testart's thesis that money is initially a means of payment)? At the origin, only a good that exists, is useful in itself, and is desired for the direct utility that the receiver will have, a good that individuals have, produce, or can obtain without too much trouble, can be demanded as payment. In most cases, speaking of payment is therefore abusive since the payer has given the good in question for nothing and did not need to acquire it from a third party. But according to Mr. Testart, the fact of having established this good as a pure means of payment prompts everyone to obtain it, thus conferring on it the character of a means of exchange. It would still be necessary to know why this payment is instituted, whether it is required of everyone, and whether everyone must use the same good or can pay it with what they have. It would also be necessary to know why a particular good is required as "payment" (probably for its utility that prevents it from becoming a means of exchange, always being used for itself, or, conversely, makes it an object or means of exchange even before it is demanded as payment), and what happens to it once paid (is it kept, consumed, or put into circulation, in other words, does it serve as money or not?). In any case, the fact that in a primitive society, all individuals have roughly the same things and therefore have the good in question, provided they produce or find it, greatly reduces the need they may have to obtain it from a third party, which brings us back to the general case in

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

the important thing is not to know what the nature or form of money was at a particular time but to understand that the notion of a means of exchange and the principle of money date back to the origin of barter, stem from Mony, and were never thought of... which should give us food for thought!

which speaking of "payment" and "money" is, in our opinion, abusive.

Mr. Testart supports his thesis on the origin of primitive monies, means of payment, by invoking either the example of underdeveloped civilizations that precisely do not need money, and it is unclear how so-called pure payment would give rise to it, or that of more developed civilizations in which money already exists, making payments possible, but not explaining how it was born. Mr. Testart's great mistake is undoubtedly to have sought in a single and nebulous cause the origin of money. Because it is likely, if not certain, that money appeared gradually for multiple reasons and under the pressure of several developments: population growth, technological advances, the emergence of new productions, social reorganization, development of internal and external exchanges, etc.

Of all these elements, the most determining was undoubtedly the last one: external exchanges. Mr. Testart rightly points out that internal exchanges, between members of the same society, were very rare. But this contradicts his thesis that payments demanded within the community would be the origin of money. Certainly, he does not argue that payments make the required goods primitive monies; he says that the capacity of these goods to settle these payments prompts those who lack them to obtain them through exchange from those who possess many, so they become means of exchange because they are, first and foremost, means of payment. But since exchanges between individuals are almost nonexistent within these societies, these goods, no more than others, are exchanged and therefore do not serve as means of exchange, only as "means of payment." This a priori reinforces Mr. Testart's idea. However, even assuming that goods can be given for nothing (what Mr. Testart calls paying), even assuming that they are actually exchanged for services, these goods cannot be considered primitive monies, as this is currently understood, since it is the exchange of goods for other goods, and not for services, and especially not for nothing, that gives birth to the concept of market value, and then a good can acquire the status of a standard of value specific to money. That certain goods, in their current state, are predisposed to become primitive monies due to being demanded in "payment" is one thing; that they are already primitive monies is another.

In the end, only a good serving as a standard of market value, officially functioning as a medium of exchange, and differing from modern currency only in its form, can be considered a primitive currency. The support for primitive currency is standard only in nature (animals, shells, fabrics, jewelry, etc.), whereas modern currency, when it exists, is standard both in terms of material (metal or paper) and form (calibration, weight, inscriptions, etc.). Primitive currencies also differ in that, being necessarily more or less durable goods with inherent utility or interest, they can always be desired for their nature rather than their function. However, the important point is that the principle of currency, as a standard of value, is born, and once this happens, it's only a matter of time before people, bound by the concept of market value and the need for currency, discover better mediums (the best being the absence of support, as it ultimately only serves to convey a belief, that the notion of value and hence a unit of value are necessary for exchange).

Currency is thus the result of a slow evolution that, throughout the ages, allows us to distinguish three types of societies: non-monetary societies, "potentially" monetary societies, and effectively monetary societies. In the first, exchanges do not occur between individuals, either because they produce collectively and share the collective product or because, producing individually, they are autonomous and, at best, engage in occasional exchanges of goods or services, exchanges that, at the moment, resemble gifts. In the second, individuals engage in barter (of goods), either among themselves or with individuals from other societies. The concept of market value then emerges, but it is still vague. Goods are equated in a whimsical manner until an "official" equivalence is adopted or established by habit. There is no currency, but the function of a medium of exchange or intermediary between exchanges appears without being attributed to a particular good, as many can fulfill this role on occasion. Currency, as a standard of value, can nevertheless be

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mr. Neuron: Mr. Accuser, it appears from what you're saying that Mony is a fate, that it is inevitable, therefore necessary and unavoidable!

Yes! Barter was an unavoidable mode of exchange! The emergence of Mony was inevitable! Currency was for a long time the only possible means of exchange! But when? In times when, due to lack of technology and knowledge, products were crafted slowly and could only change hands through direct or indirect exchanges between individuals. Mony was then born. Currency later appeared and, in turn, perpetuated Mony, as technical limitations still prevented people from doing without it. Now, what is the connection between those times and ours, where no one produces anything alone, where each is just a link in the vast chain that daily pours a stream of products onto the market? If we objectively consider things, disregarding money, producers are a group of specialized and complementary individuals (within their businesses, which are themselves complementary at the "Society" level) all working directly or indirectly for the market, hence for "Society." The overall product is not the sum of individual efforts but the result of their combination. Essentially, producers form a community, just like primitive communities where all members worked together. The only difference is that today, the common product is not shared equally or according to needs but consumed based on each one's purchasing power. The only thing preventing them from truly forming a community (of equals) or a Society is money... which dictates that workers be paid (unequally) and always consume as individuals, while fundamentally, they produce as Citizens and should therefore benefit as such from the City's blessings. Money necessarily perpetuates the logic of barter, but it is not logical to keep

foreshadowed by a reference good serving not as currency but as a unit of account, with the value of things established in relation to a theoretical quantity of this good.

Finally, in the third type of societies, equivalences are established only in relation to a good consecrated as currency, whether it be primitive or modern. The difficulty lies in determining when a society transitions from the second type to the third. The mere appearance of currency (through innovation or importation) is not sufficient for its widespread use (across all layers of society). Different ways of establishing the market value of things and manipulating it coexist for a long time. However, these are just details. It doesn't fundamentally matter whether a society belongs to the second or third type since, in both cases, exchanges are based on the same logic. The key is to understand why and how this logic appears, why and how a non-monetary society gradually becomes potentially monetary, then effectively monetary, and, above all, what changes this brings about.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

money when exchanges are no longer fundamentally barter, and Mony has no reason to exist.

This is where the social consequences of barter must be understood. To do this, we must first understand how things were before it disrupted them. As we mentioned, people lived in communities, in small groups of a few dozen members. Everyone knew each other. Everyone participated in the community's life. They together ensured their security and, to some extent, their subsistence⁷. They lived according to the laws of political association present in every animal union. These laws are dictated by the instinct of self-preservation, urging social animals to unite or remain united with congeners to increase personal security. The increase in security is due to the tacit commitment of each individual to defend, as much as possible, their associates. Everyone, therefore, has duties towards all others and must, in return, enjoy all the security that others can guarantee. Associates are equal in duties and rights. The extent of their duties and rights then depends on the species' capabilities and the association's potential, whose fundamental principle is Equality.

Man is a social being. It is his sociability that makes him reject the state of nature and drives him to live in Society. When he was just an instinct-driven animal, he respected the laws of political association without even knowing it. But his particular abilities led him to violate them unknowingly. These abilities are the ability to evolve, think, and manufacture, all of which led him to produce and exchange. However, for the reasons we have indicated, the first possible way of exchanging, and the only one at the time, was barter. People who lived in Society without philosophizing about what it is and should be also practiced this mode of exchange without reflection. Moreover, at first glance, it made no difference to them. Also, they could not see why barter posed a problem, and they could not have given it up if it did.

In appearance, barter changes nothing. It is at the level of the principles of social order that it overturns everything. By definition, barter is suitable for exchanges between a small number of individuals who know each other and

⁷ Eating is a right that stems from the right to security. No one dies of hunger in a primitive community, unless it is a famine affecting everyone. When food is the result of collective effort (hunting, fishing, harvesting), it is shared among the members of the community. Outside of this scenario, each individual (or family) must procure their own food by their own means. However, someone who has been fortunate in their quest for food does not and should not have the right to let their less fortunate neighbor go hungry.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

all produce or work to have products to exchange. It is a friendly framework that, a priori, differs in no way from a community. That's the trap! In fact, this restricted framework masks the disastrous effects of the antisocial principles on which this mode of exchange is based, and which only become apparent when the circle of exchange protagonists widens. (This is another reason why Man fell into the slowly closing trap.) While, in a community, individuals work alone or in groups to fulfill a duty towards it and then enjoy its benefits as members of the social body, individuals who barter produce for themselves and only withdraw what they obtain from the exchange of their production. If they still have the impression of fulfilling what can no longer be called a duty, their "rights" no longer depend on "Society" but on their personal efforts, luck, the goodwill of others, etc. There is no longer a Society. If not for the conviviality offered by a limited framework, it would be the reign of each for himself, the law of the jungle, a return to the state of nature.

Barter gives rise to several paradoxes. Firstly, it lowers citizens to the status of individuals, but, simultaneously, through the exchanges it involves, it reduces distances between individuals and even maintains friendly relations among them. Secondly, while each believes themselves to be autonomous or independent, barter proves that the exchange participants are complementary, interdependent, seemingly forming a society. Lastly, and not the least subtle of its paradoxes, barter requires each producer to consider themselves the owner of their production so that they can do with it as they please, including exchanging it. In other words, producers must legitimately own what they produce, even though there is no longer a society to recognize any right, especially this one. True rights exist only within the framework of a political association, that is, a society or a city, where individuals participate in the life of the city, each fulfilling the same duties towards their associates or fellow citizens and thereby mutually guaranteeing the same rights. But how does an individual working for themselves, according to their whims, fulfill a duty towards others? By what authority are those others, with whom they are not associated, obligated to acknowledge their right to enjoy the fruits of their labor? In the state of nature, no one has rights; nothing belongs to anyone; everything is at the disposal of whoever has the strength to seize or retain it. That is the subtlety. Barter annihilates society in its principles, but by keeping individuals close together, by perpetuating a certain solidarity among them, it

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

always gives the appearance of a concentration of individuals. Furthermore, while barter eliminates the fundamental duty for a citizen to participate (in the economic sense of the term) in the life of the city, individuals still maintain ties with each other. They no longer "need" others on a daily basis, but they still rely on them in times of danger and extraordinary circumstances. Failing to constitute a society worthy of the name, they coexist and need laws to make this cohabitation as harmonious as possible, particularly regarding property. In fact, as much as the principles of social order deny citizens the ownership of their production resulting from the fulfillment of a duty towards the city, being the owner of one's production is an absolute necessity in a barter exchange system, as individuals must possess what they exchange. Thus, not only did men not reflect on the principles of political association before practicing barter, but their direct interest was to ignore them as soon as they engaged in it.

However, as we have mentioned, the conditions of barter mask the harmful effects of its principles. But over time, money appeared. We must now delve into the logic of barter to understand how catastrophic the transition was. The fundamental idea behind barter is that it is fair to exchange goods, properties, of a presumed equivalent value. But on what criteria could primitive men base the "intrinsic" value of things, a concept that, in itself, makes no sense? They probably took into account the time required to manufacture them, the danger faced to seize or obtain them, etc. Inevitably, they brought into the exchanges the force of their desire, the difficulty of obtaining the desired object, its rarity, etc. Since they knew their neighbors, they could even consider their needs. Whatever their considerations, exchanges took place, and over time, what we would call standard prices were established, not in currency but based on the quantity of other goods, and then based on the quantity of a reference good. These reference goods allowed men to conceive a value for each thing even before it was exchanged so that even during direct exchanges (that is, exchanges without resorting to a medium of exchange), the primitive considerations we envisaged were stifled by "official" values. It is not difficult to understand how, under these conditions, useful but abundant productions lost value in favor of coveted and rare goods, condemning producers of the first kind of goods to work harder than others or lose out in the exchange. Nevertheless, the very act of bartering in a restricted framework ensured that

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

each of the exchange participants produced something and further guaranteed the greatest possible fairness. However, as the scope of exchange widened, this assurance gradually disappeared, and all the flaws of the system became apparent.

Barter sustains illusions that money dispels. When two individuals exchange goods, they are swapping their possessions—goods they have typically produced themselves and for which the law recognizes them as owners. In essence, barter is a transfer of properties, i.e., rights. However, as the goods do not have the same price, meaning the same value during exchanges, they represent more or less value and, consequently, embody more or less exchangeable property rights. Thus, there are two notions of Property: 1) absolute property, meaning the inviolable right that individuals have over the goods they own (whether produced or acquired), and 2) relative property, i.e., a measurable right equal to the value that the owned goods take in the context of exchange—a right that is no longer a whole but a sum of rights. The confusion between these two notions of Property is constant.

Money perpetuates this exchange and "Property" schema. Goods, properties, represent money. A sum of money, obtained usually through a sale, represents both the sold goods and the relinquished property rights, as well as goods of equivalent value it will enable one to purchase, conferring the right of ownership upon them. Money (or a sum of monetary units) symbolizes the reference good that, under barter, is acquired to be exchanged. Thus, like a good, it embodies property rights. But it is more than that.

Under barter, any good, any property, can be exchanged. Similarly, in a monetary system, everything can be sold. However, within the framework of monetary exchange, not everything allows for purchasing. The *raison d'être* of money is to facilitate exchanges and dictate that all purchases go through it. Therefore, being the only accepted means of payment in most cases, money not only embodies property rights, but it alone confers the right to access the market—that is, the right to buy, the right to consume, the right to possess, in other words, the right to enjoy the benefits of the "City." A penniless individual cannot buy anything: they have no right to anything, no rights, and, in fact, no freedom. Consequently, in the end, money embodies all rights (at least

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONEY

essential rights). Thus, the fundamental need of individuals is no longer, as under barter, to produce goods to be able to exchange them, but to have money to be able to buy and satisfy, as much as possible, through this means alone, their needs and desires. All means are therefore fair to obtain it. Why? For the simple reason that a seller cannot know how their customer, whom they do not know, acquired the sum they demand. The law may prohibit buying with dirty money, but for a seller, money has no scent. In practice, money is equally valid in the hands of an honest worker who acquired it legitimately, as in the hands of a thief, a criminal, a beggar, a speculator, etc. It can reward both work and crime. In fact, it pays more for vice than virtue because vice does not hesitate to resort to means to which virtue does not stoop. Thus, wealth, which embodies rights in proportion, is generally the prerogative of vice and crime. The greater the wealth, the more it is coveted, and the greater the corrupting power it bestows!

We have stated that, under barter, inequality is established simply through the play of values. However, through monetary exchange, it increases in frightening proportions. It would be impossible to acquire, through barter, the power that wealth provides. This is because, under barter, individuals are all independent and almost autonomous producers. Some may have slightly more than others, but none are in poverty. In a monetary system, producing or working does not protect against poverty. Remember that money appears when exchanges become more intense, when each person's specialization increases, at a time when individuals are less autonomous than they were under barter. Consequently, they are more dependent on each other, which, for some, leads to an initial devaluation of their productions. This devaluation is then accentuated by the fact that a producer, like everyone else, needs money and is thus at the mercy of the one who pays. Finally, their rights are further diminished by the fact that from inequality emerge powerful entities that strip them more or less openly by force. Money was, moreover, instituted by the States (not invented by them) to facilitate, among other things, tax collection and the payment of troops.

Embodied by individuals' rights, even without their awareness, money is a formidable means of oppression through action or inaction. In daily life, wage

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

masses⁸ are deprived of their rights by companies that pay them poorly. Outside the company, they are reaped by the State, directly or indirectly. Everywhere, on every occasion, those who have power due to their wealth or "social" position can pay them meagerly or demand from them in payment whatever they want, under any pretext. Due to their position of inferiority, they are not only obliged to listen but also to justify to preserve their self-esteem. By justifying the monetary logic that is the cause of their enslavement, however, people deprive themselves of the ability to conceive of another logic, specifically that of political association, that of RIGHTS. Thus, it is in the nature of Mony to exercise an indomitable power and to give men, through Mony, both power and chains. Mony, which people persist in seeing as nothing more than a means of exchange, facilitates all kinds of transactions that are rarely exchanges. If it is a means, it is primarily a means of oppression!

Mr. Neuron: Mony is a means of exchange, perhaps of oppression, but it certainly is not an oppressor! It is a means for individuals who are solely guilty of its misuse! Mony is just a means!

Do you even know, citizen, what oppression is? Do you believe that streets need to be lined with bayonets, that a government must establish a regime based on brute force, terror, and arbitrariness before it can be considered oppression? You confuse oppression and tyranny, and you only see tyranny in political dictatorship. However, if political dictatorship necessarily accompanies oppression, there is oppression as soon as "Citizens" are unequal, as soon as the famous "social divide" becomes apparent. Men are no less oppressed when their Rights as "Citizens" are violated by force,

⁸ By salaried masses, we mean all individuals, excluding merchants and independent producers, who receive a salary, whether they are paid by the task, day, month, etc

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

cunning, or in fact. Yet, this is the order of things into which Mony plunges men. There can be no Equality in Rights between Citizens where the obsession is to establish a so-called equivalence of value between things, where the fundamental rights of individuals are attached to money and not to Citizenship. Inequality is not then an accident; it is a fate.

But just because inequality is fate in a monetary system, just because, by the nature of the latter, some must benefit, others suffer, there are neither oppressed nor oppressors. When the masses live in discomfort or even poverty, far from conditions befitting the Dignity of the Citizen⁹, it is because they are coerced and forced in one way or another. Conversely, when an individual lives in opulence amidst a much less affluent multitude, it is not the exchange of his labor that has given him so much wealth, nor are his talents — if he has any — alone that have elevated him above the masses, nor are his own strengths what allowed him to conquer this position or maintain it. It is the intrinsic aberrations of the monetary system, aberrations that some euphemistically term "opportunities." In fact, the law of the fittest is to the state of Nature what the law of the richest is to the monetary system. Since Mony, by its nature, generates an inherently unequal order of things, the use of brute force is unnecessary to maintain inequalities. Generally, it suffices for the rich and powerful to invoke the laws of Mony (integrated by human laws) to justify their policies and circumvent dissenters. They, however, keep brute force as a last resort against rumbling or unleashed masses. But, unless constituted as bourgeois guards, as during the French Revolution, the strength of the rich does not reside in their own forces. It comes, on the one hand, from the laws (all in their favor, since they make them or have them made for them) and the coercive apparatus at their service; on the other hand, from armies of satellites at their beck and call and courtiers at their feet, not to mention the swarms of useful idiots and happy fools. One should not be mistaken: the use of force is not intended to preserve inequality but only to protect their interests. If today's rich disappear, others will inevitably take their places tomorrow.

9 The Dignity of the Citizen is not a vague idea. It consists, for a Citizen, in enjoying all the rights that the City recognizes for any one of its Citizens, thus being equal in rights to all fellow citizens. It is therefore difficult for individuals who are unfamiliar with the concept of Equality to grasp the true meaning of the Dignity of the Citizen. However, it is sufficient to observe and even feel that inequality prevails to assert that there is an infringement on the Dignity of the "Citizens."

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

We thus say that, in a monetary system, brute force is as useless for maintaining inequality as it is incapable of eradicating it. Peace, however, is only apparent, as inequality is inherently violence done to "Citizens." Depriving individuals of part of their Rights or threatening to strip them of what little they still enjoy is indeed an exercise of moral violence with concrete consequences. Is it not an act of violence to reduce individuals to famine or essentially dictate their menu? Is it not an act of violence to deprive them of housing or force them to live in cramped quarters? Is it not an act of violence to deprive them of employment, control their lives, and disrupt their families? Is it not an act of violence to push someone to despair and drive them to suicide? Isn't it violent for men to know that someone can have such power over them, even if it's not exercised with a gun in hand?

It appears quite evident that the monetary system is a state of oppression. What else could it be? It is no longer the state of Nature, which is total anarchy, but it is not a genuine state of Society, which is the most harmonious order. It lies in between. Barter and then money somehow subject men to the law of the jungle, even though they tend to live in Society. The result is a unique, aberrant situation specific to Man, a state that is neither order nor disorder: a capitalist anarchy, an individualistic "Society," a frozen disorder.

But how can one explain the fact that few people are aware of being oppressed and even fewer feel like oppressors when inequality prevails with all its accompanying oppressions? The main cause of this general unawareness lies in the ignorance of what Equality is and the ridiculous belief that, under the pretext that all "Citizens" have the right to vote or consume (provided, of course, they have the means), Equality reigns¹⁰. In fact, as we have said, men who aspire to tranquility desire to live in Society and want to believe that they constitute one, even though it is evident that they do not. Therefore, they cannot understand the true meaning of words like Society, Equality, Right, Citizen, etc. Seeing Equality in Rights where there is only

¹⁰ It is urgently necessary to focus on restoring democracy, with a central role for direct universal suffrage, free and reasoned public debate. The growing gap between representative bodies and the social body unfolding before our eyes across the Western world opens a zone of uncertainties for freedoms already weakened by the onslaught of markets." Anne-Cécile Robert, *Manière de voir* 83, *Le Monde diplomatique*, October - November 2005, p. 26. — This statement effectively illustrates how, under the pretext of turning a blind eye or not daring to defy money, people beat around the bush and why they cannot find the right solution to the problem they have incorrectly framed. Isn't it indeed surprising that establishing equality among citizens does not appear more urgent than anything else, especially for those who proclaim themselves champions of democracy? Because there is no, there cannot be, and there will never be true democracy in inequality, under the sway of money, amid the 'onslaught of markets.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

oppression, they cannot see themselves as oppressed, even less as oppressors.

In truth, they are not completely deceived. But instead of considering themselves "oppressed," they label themselves as "exploited." The reason is simple, though always unconscious: the state of oppression concerns "Society" in general, while exploitation relates to their situation as workers. The use of this word, ostensibly innocent, allows them to approach the problem from a particular point of view instead of embracing it in its entirety, from a social perspective. They thus reduce the question of social organization to a question of enterprise or labor organization, and that of Rights to a question of wages. In other words, by playing on words like this, they endorse the monetary system, denouncing only one aspect of it and paradoxically obscuring questions related to the existence of Mony, which is at the heart of inequality.

One last reason why men are not aware of being oppressed or living in a state of oppression is that they are content with what Mony allows them to have or do, that they compare their situation to more dramatic situations than theirs, that they naturally have few desires to satisfy or are satisfied with their state, etc. However, these reasonings bear the very mark of Mony, which divides Citizens and instills in them an individualistic mentality! The question of whether a state of affairs is oppressive or not is not a personal one. To be oppressed is not to have the same rights as all one's "Fellow Citizens" and to have fewer rights than others. The question is not whether we are happy without the Rights we cannot enjoy, but to understand that Citizens must be equal in Rights, whether they use all their Rights or not, and that even if, as an individual, one does not seem to suffer from being deprived of certain Rights, this deprivation constitutes oppression.

Now, citizen, notice that in your objection, you have at times distinguished between money and "Mony," and at times confused the two, ultimately ending up seeing in Mony only the money, as a means of exchange. Let us first recall that Mony is not money but the belief that the notion of (market) value is necessary for exchange. Mony is the *raison d'être* of monetary units used to measure the value of things or attribute value to them. "Mony," being a belief, implies a certain way of reasoning and therefore naturally has effects on the

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

way people think. We have already explained how this belief emerged and imposed itself on people through the practice of barter. Thus, it is not by design that people adopted this belief, and it is even incorrect to say that they adopted it. This alone should be sufficient to dismiss the argument that Mony is merely a means of exchange. However, this argument is encountered too often for us to be content with so little.

People have many words (including "argent") to refer to money; none for what we call "Mony." However, money, which is indeed a means of exchange, merely puts into practice the principles that stem from "Mony." So, what importance is there in observing coldly that money exists if one ignores the principles that underlie its existence, if one ignores that it is only the tip of the iceberg? None. This is what we are going to demonstrate.

The idea that Mony is just a means of exchange is indicative of people's obsession: to have a means of exchange at their disposal. This obsession is entirely legitimate since specialized and complementary producers need each other to live, and in one way or another, they must exchange their productions. However, the urgency of needing a means of exchange makes people more concerned with retaining what they have than considering what it is and contemplating what a means of exchange worthy of society should be. Do you believe, jurors citizens, that people ever gathered to answer such questions: On what Principles does our association rest? Why do we need a means of exchange? What and who should it serve? How to deserve it? What should it be? No! They never asked such questions because then they would have agreed that only citizens can possess it, that it must be obtained by participating in the life of the city, that it can only be used to acquire products or benefit from the services offered by the city, and that, in no case, should it harm Equality in the Rights of citizens. They would not have adopted money that violates all principles and allows all commandments of common sense to be broken. They did not ask these questions because they never felt the need since, when they conceived the concept of a means of exchange, they already used money or had always practiced barter, the logic of which (Mony) kept them prisoners. They were in the matrix. Since then, no generation has dared to believe that such a central element of human life and "society" could have been adopted and perpetuated lightly by previous generations. Each

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

believed it to be self-evident, and all successively fell into the trap. Even when, by some miracle, some question it, O mercy! They cannot free themselves from monetary prejudices: they forcibly integrate into their reasoning any units (but necessarily serving to perpetuate the notion of market value, inherited from barter, and to establish a kind of price) and do not go beyond the concept of exchange between individuals (whether direct or indirect). There are indeed texts on "Mony," in the sense of money, but not a single law defines the social purpose of money, how a means of exchange stamped with the seal of "society" should be earned, what it should be used for, and by whom. Not one sees in money the materialization of the rights of citizens and, in its mere existence, an eternal obstacle to Equality. Worse! Money, which annihilates the state of rights, appears in Declarations of "rights" as a natural parameter, without any reason other than the accomplished fact. There are also many books and newspaper articles proposing or listing tricks to gain it legally or illegally or not to lose it, describing how it circulates, coldly noting or naively indignant about its destructive effects¹¹, etc. Still, none had yet distinguished money from Mony and established as clearly as we do the relationship between Rights and fortune. All our economic books discuss Mony in the world and the world of Mony... not one has delved into Mony itself¹²! It is at the center of everything

11 The palm of indignation goes to the weekly magazine *Marianne* for its issue number 586 (July 12 to 18, 2008), which had the headline: "This society that revolves around a single sun... MONEY." A month earlier, in issue number 581 (June 7 to 13), the headline read: "The dictatorship of speculators." When will this magazine decide to headline "Money, the enemy to be brought down"? In the following September, the daily newspaper *Libération*, a champion in all categories of good intentions and conventional wisdom, boldly titled "Punishing crazy money," and as an epitaph, "seven ideas to regulate financial markets" (issue number 8518, September 24, 2008). Capitalism still shudders at such examples. Similar instances could be multiplied indefinitely.

12 There exists a book about (on) Joseph Beuys, titled "Qu'est-ce que l'argent?" ("What is money?") (L'Arche, Paris, 1994). The book captures a debate that took place in 1991. Here are the responses from various participants:

- WILLERT: "But still: 'What is money?' 'It is nothing': that is the only possible answer. But it works. Money works because in people's minds, precisely, it is not considered as nothing." (p. 17)
- EHRLICHER: "[...] money has never stopped changing its nature." (p. 18)
- BEUYS: "[...] money is a commodity, that is to say, an economic value [...] and that it must become precisely a 'to-be,' that it becomes a legal document for all creative processes of human labor [...]" (p. 23)
- BETHMANN: "[...] one must consider as money: any claim that exists in the economic domain between an economic partner and another economic partner and that is expressed in money, that is formulated in monetary value." (p. 26)

We see that all of them are, in fact, talking about currency, and none comes close to our definition of "money." The most relevant statement in this debate was made by Beuys: "Money, which even today is an economic value and is harmful in this field because with it one can buy and speculate, and a polarization of people has occurred between employers and employees, must lose this status and be introduced into what it is today, in accordance with its nature, in the current state of human consciousness: a legal regulator for all creative processes. In other words, money must entirely express rights and duties." (p. 51) In fact, Beuys confuses the notion of a medium of exchange with that of money and expects money

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

but is not considered as an object of reflection! Two reasons for this, in addition to those we have already advanced: 1) Mony is reduced to a means, which dispenses with interest and allows people to denounce a scapegoat among them, something easier, more enjoyable, and sterile; 2) its inconsistencies are so impressive, the interests at stake so colossal, and the power of the rich so manifest that people prefer to look away and see in it only a means when it is primarily a belief. So, Mony would be just a means of exchange. We said it was more than money. But is money itself only a means?

First, let's note the absurdity of this reflection. Money is indeed a means of exchange. But what is the point of saying that it is "only" a means of exchange? This does not change the fact that it is a means of exchange, so it has properties, effects, and consequences! However, by saying that money is "only" a means of exchange, people seem to be trying to belittle it to less than nothing, to deny its existence, or at least, they believe they are thereby exempt from asking questions about it. Mony, less than nothing! It's quite powerful—or cunning—coming from people for whom it is a god!

Let us grant that money is a means of exchange. As a means, it is a kind of tool. But is the nature of a tool indifferent? Can one use a hammer, a saw, a screwdriver, a toothbrush, etc., interchangeably? No! These tools allow for specific tasks and cannot be used interchangeably. It would be to deny this obvious fact to answer the question "What is a hammer?" with "It is 'only' a tool" because, besides not answering the question, it would imply that as a tool, regardless of its function, it can be used for everything, at the user's discretion, which is absurd. A tool can have no use other than the one for which its nature is intended. The same applies to money.

Some may argue that a tool can be diverted from its proper use. Fine! Nevertheless, a hammer cannot be used for much else other than striking, and it cannot replace or be replaced by a toothbrush in any way. And the reverse is even more true! Try brushing your teeth with a hammer! Furthermore, only money interests us. What, then, is its function, its purpose?

to play a role, as a medium of exchange, that it is inherently incapable of fulfilling. It is true that a medium of exchange in line with the interests of society must attest to duties fulfilled and open the door to rights. However, money, let's not forget, imposes inequality and thus annihilates the state of rights.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

To buy and pay¹³. It has no other. The fact that it allows buying anything and everything, rewarding both work and crime, is not contrary to its function. The fact that a large purchasing power confers power in general is not a diverted use of money; it is in the logic of things. The fact that it allows capitalization or accumulation of money, i.e., the ability to set it aside in one time to buy in another, is in no way contrary to its function; it is in its nature. The desire to gain it at the expense of humanity is fueled by the appetite stimulated by lack (real or psychological) or by the power that wealth provides; it is a consequence of money, but it still does not divert money itself from its function. Those who, instead of questioning money, argue that it should be used differently, will retort that it is precisely humans who misuse it. But how to set up barriers that money, by its nature, either lifts or does not forbid crossing? Why deny that these uses or effects, however unworthy, are fundamentally allowed by money? There is a profound difference between what the well-intentioned hope for and what money allows! And it is precisely because it thwarts unfortunate predictions, vain hopes, and bad calculations that one must stop being blind to it. Allowing it to remain in the hands of humans while vehemently denouncing its so-called misuse is like providing them with a weapon and then reproaching them for using it; it is to become an accomplice in their crime and be more guilty than they are. It is also paradoxical to assert strongly that money is a means and, at the same time,

13 In "Aux origines de la monnaie," Alain Testart makes a distinction between buying and paying, viewing money as both a medium of exchange and a means of payment. By "paying," he means the act of transferring a monetary sum in exchange for nothing or to settle a debt, which sometimes encompasses the case of purchases (involving a transfer of goods). For him, money is primarily a means of payment, as "every purchase involves payment, but not every payment implies a purchase" (p. 23). Thus, "The function of a medium of exchange is directly deduced from the function of a means of payment" (p. 29). He makes a significant error.

The purpose of money is to enable the buying of goods or the payment for services, i.e., to benefit from the work of others in the form of goods or services (which, in theory, is justified by the fact that the payer has earned the monetary sum through their work, which they exchange for an equivalent-valued good or service). Paying for a service is not a purchase but remains an exchange. Therefore, the purpose of money is indeed to be a medium of exchange, and precisely because it offers the possibility of buying goods or paying for services, it is desired.

It is because the system is monetary that goods have a price, and individuals, alone or collectively, need money, even if they do not use it themselves for purchases. If exchanges were not monetary, money, as a means of payment in the sense Testart understands it, would have no reason to exist or would not be considered as such. For example, why would the state collect taxes in money if its employees and other workers did not need money to live? Why and how would "Citizens" be financially indebted? Why would there be collections in churches? etc. The various types of currencies and their different uses are a consequence of the existence of money as a medium of exchange, a means of buying. It is the fact that money is a medium of exchange, a coveted "object," that allows it to be a means of payment, and not the other way around.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

to obstinately refuse to change it as one would do without hesitation for any other tool that proves inadequate?

But to say that money is only a means of exchange still implies that there can be no other means of exchange than it, or that another means of exchange would change nothing. However, how can one know that there is no other when such discourse annihilates any desire to search for one? And how can one put forth the idea that another means of exchange would change nothing when we do not know what it could be¹⁴ — and when we already do not grasp the role of money? The purpose of this trial is not to answer these questions, but we must nevertheless show the absurdity of these objections.

As a means of exchange, money is a tool, a tool that has its own characteristics and others that are common to all means of exchange. However, not conceiving of another means of exchange than money does not authorize us to affirm that it is the only one possible. We also know that money is a means of exchange that imposes inequality in rights among individuals, whereas the fundamental principle of the City is Equality among citizens. Therefore, there must be a means of exchange that, instead of annihilating the principles of social order, would support them.

It follows that it is utterly absurd to think that two radically different means of exchange would have the same effects. That humans do not yet conceive a true alternative to money (a means of exchange they have not even thought of but that has imposed itself on them) is one thing; but, on this pretext, to claim that another means of exchange (which this time would be rigorously thought out and consciously adopted), a means of exchange that would not have Mony as its basis and would function differently than money, a means of exchange that, by its nature, would guarantee Equality — in short, that such a means of exchange would have the same effects as money is another. By definition, this is impossible.

Here, only the effects of money interest us, which stem from its characteristics. Its function, as a means of exchange, is to allow its holder to acquire goods and pay for services. But it is a means of exchange that is exchanged, passing from hand to hand, from one individual to another. This

¹⁴ Those who, after seriously considering the matter, declare that another means of exchange would change nothing are, in reality, contemplating means of exchange still based on money and are only variations of currency.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONEY

characteristic comes from barter, which, let's recall, is an individualistic exchange system. Money confers the right to buy goods or pay for services because it represents in terms of value the object that, under barter, was exchanged for another, as it theoretically obtained in exchange for a production or personal work and can thus be exchanged for a supposedly equivalent-value good or service (representing work). But for money to represent all goods, all properties, and ultimately all activities, the monetary unit must embody little property rights¹⁵, in other words, represent a property of very low market value¹⁶. Thus, all goods and services, regardless of their value at the moment, are represented or representable by a certain number of monetary units, a number called price. People then see money only as a standard of market value¹⁷ that allows establishing prices, and a means of exchange that they need to buy goods and enjoy services, in short, to consume. Ultimately, it does not matter whether they know what money is and where it comes from. What matters is that it materializes the right to consume and increasingly appropriates it as they specialize, need to exchange, and only exchange through it.

All the consequences of money result from this materialization, in the form of units (concrete or virtual), of the right to consume, i.e., to access the market.

The first serious consequence of this materialization is the dissociation that occurs between duties and rights because the latter, being conferred on individuals by money, being embodied by monetary units, no longer depend on the duties they fulfill or not but on the units they have. Money, theoretically obtained in exchange for a production or work, which theoretically confers rights in exchange for a duty, in practice transforms rights into objects, which are at the mercy of all imaginable attacks (theft, etc.) and all unforeseeable accidents (loss, etc.), moreover, in objects that each must obtain from others (since it is a means of exchange that is exchanged). Direct consequence:

15 We assert that money embodies the right of ownership because, even though it is also used to pay for services and does not always represent goods or future properties, it is, in a way, a form of ownership in itself. Nevertheless, this masks the fact that exchanges, even of goods, are primarily exchanges of labor.

16 Indeed, the earliest forms of money (cattle, ingots, etc.) were often valuable commodities in themselves. However, their high intrinsic value posed a hindrance to their function as a common medium of exchange. Those that, by their nature, could not be easily divided into units of lesser value were abandoned and replaced. Cattle were abandoned, and ingots gave way to coins.

17 This way of thinking was established not with modern currencies but from the very emergence of barter, as soon as people, unable to exchange in any other way, sought to establish equivalences between objects. The indirect exchange that developed under barter and became the classical mode of exchange under money did not bring about this mentality; it instead inherited it, merely pushing its logic and consequences to the extreme.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

theoretically, only individuals participating in economic activity can have rights (since money, which conveys the notion of market value, circulates and is conquered in the market), and the extent of the rights of these individuals — embodied by the amount of money they will have for personal purposes — depends primarily on the goodwill of those who pay them (employers, purchasing centers, etc.) and then on those who are in a position to demand payment from them (the State, owners, etc.). In practice, workers share the rights they earn with their families. The State can also mitigate the severity of the system for those who do not work or earn almost nothing by adopting so-called benevolent laws, i.e., by granting them financial assistance (compensation, pensions, reimbursements, bonuses, etc.), assistance that many individuals who do not deserve them quickly manage to benefit from.

By materializing rights (of which people are only vaguely aware), money allows, on one hand, the stripping of workers and all those who contribute in their own way to the life of the "City" outside the economic framework¹⁸, and on the other hand, the sustenance of all kinds of prevaricators and profiteers. Consequently, people have no idea of their rights as citizens or their duties and are incapable of conceiving what Equality is. Therefore, they do not fight against Mony for Equality, for their rights, but for mere coins! Even when they protest, as workers, as individuals, they limit themselves to demanding, in one form or another, meager wage increases instead of demanding Equality and the recognition of their citizenship, thus the recognition of all their rights as citizens! They persist in seeing "Mony" as a neutral means and refuse to admit that this so-called means neutralizes them! These financial claims — which some take for the pinnacle of anti-capitalist action — have the real result of a loss of energy. Whether or not they are satisfied, they maintain faith in Mony, perpetuate monetary logic, and at best allow workers to gather crumbs that the constant rise in prices will suffice to consume. These protests are missed opportunities to awaken the atrophied sense of Citizenship in capitalists¹⁹ and bring about the reign of Equality.

18 In this way, for example, stay-at-home mothers and students are deprived. But how could they be aware of this, given that their rights as full-fledged citizens have never been recognized, as capitalism is financially incapable of ensuring them? We could also mention, with some nuances, the case of retirees, disabled individuals, etc.

19 Most workers are also capitalists. Because capitalists are not only individuals who have capital, but anyone who, knowingly or not, supports capitalism or any form of monetary system. Therefore, anyone who does not see money as the major obstacle to equality, the main enemy of humanity, and the tyrant to be overthrown is in this category.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Of course, workers are not the only ones obsessed with Mony, especially since the materialization of rights allows them to be acquired other than through work. We have already mentioned those who defraud the state... We could also talk about those who live off theft, illegal activities, illicit trafficking, etc. All these acts prohibited by law, however, provide those involved with Money (in the sense of currency), i.e., rights that "Society" does not recognize to them, but of which they still enjoy. This clearly demonstrates that, in practice, rights depend less on "Society" or the law than on Mony. This is another consequence of the fact that essential rights are contained in money, instead of being conferred by Citizenship and subordinate to the will of the City.

Let's also recall that, just as money represents the goods (and labor) it allows you to buy, goods represent money. Mony thus leads people to live in a world where everything has a price, where everything has market value, so that they no longer see the world except through it. Although they poorly grasp the relationship between money and their rights, they do understand the interest in gaining more and the inconvenience of losing it. Therefore, they rarely let an opportunity to acquire it (in the form of money or goods) pass, and they try to avoid spending it unnecessarily; they sell instead of giving, they always try to get without paying, they steal from each other, etc. They are sometimes stingy, sometimes greedy; sometimes petty, sometimes dishonest; sometimes beggars, sometimes thieves, etc. In short, Mony makes them vicious.

Mr. Cupid: But nothing prevents people from not being so! Even without Mony, they would fight! Man is inherently evil!

Nothing prevents people from not being vicious! So, citizen, you assume that they could be virtuous despite Mony. But how could they escape its influence? Even when they are not chasing after it, it catches up with them

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

and blackmails them! Whether they want it or not, whether they are aware of it or not, individuals caught in a monetary system reason and react in their own way, according to their nature, but all in relation to Mony and the world as it shapes it. Therefore, how could people be virtuous when they cannot escape the influence of Mony that drives them to vice?

You are indeed too light, citizen, in saying that NOTHING prevents people from not being vicious when, on the contrary, everything compels them to be. You also provide new evidence of the influence of Mony by asserting that Man is inherently evil. For, citizen, which Man are you talking about? About which Man can you speak, if not the one you have in front of you, the one you know, in other words, Man living under Mony since time immemorial? This Man is certainly not good. But to affirm that Man is inherently evil is to jump to conclusions; it is, once again, to disregard the monetary context in which he evolves and which necessarily marks him; it is to betray the weakness you have shown, the weakness of not seeing Mony, much less its effects, and in doing so, to make Man the only possible cause of all evils; it is nothing less than exempting oneself from reflection.

Why would humans be inherently bad? After all, they are fundamentally animals. Animals, even when sociable, are neither good nor bad, neither vicious nor virtuous. An animal is not a philosopher. Its sole instinctive concern is survival. Humans were once in this position as well. The vice is specific to the kind of humans we know. So, what happened to the human species, or rather the current "human society," that fundamentally distinguishes it from others? It's commerce, practiced today through barter (direct or indirect with money). It's evident that commerce, primarily involving the exchange of objects, is linked to the exceptional abilities of humans to manufacture them. However, these abilities didn't prevent humans from living in society²⁰ for a long time, in harmony, much like other sociable species (some of which are not devoid of creative capacities). Humans, though, are the only living beings that conceive of production—making things—not just to directly satisfy their needs but to exchange their products.

20 The first primitive forms of money date back to approximately 10,000 years ago (in China). However, it is impossible to date the first barter system. Let's say it goes back 50,000 years or even 100,000 years. Now, considering that humans have existed for about 2 million years (starting from *Homo habilis*), exchanges in the form of barter or monetary systems are relatively recent in the history of humanity. In fact, humans lived in societies, in the true sense of the term, for much longer than under the influence of money.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

At this point in our reflection, some may argue that we've only confirmed the assertion that humans are inherently bad or something akin to it since they are forever endowed with these capacities and thus destined to exchange. But this assumes that we consider exchanges the very source of the evil that permeates humans and forever corrupts "human society." However, the issue is not exchange but how it is conducted.

Living in society allowed humans to develop their capacities, and exchanges, in turn, strengthen social bonds, at least in theory. This is also observed in many animal societies. However, as we've seen, humans, compelled to resort to barter, eventually dissolve society. Thus, it's crucial to understand the difference between exchange and barter.

Barter is a specific mode of exchange occurring between two individuals (or two groups) and usually involves the exchange of goods. While it's possible for two individuals to exchange a good for a service or even a service for another, it remains barter since the exchange always takes place between individuals. Barter is not the sole possible mode of exchange, especially evident when considering the exchange of services practiced by sociable animals. However, in animals, this exchange doesn't occur between individuals; it takes place between the individual and the group. The individual provides services to the group by participating alone or with others in its activities and, in return, receives protection and sustenance. It's this social dimension of exchange that humans annihilated when they started to produce and exchange goods. However, it's not the act of producing or exchanging goods that destroys this dimension; it's the lack of an alternative for exchange, leading to barter, which is still practiced today through money. Yet, in an era where most workers are essentially service²¹ providers and source their supplies from businesses, the concept of individualistic exchange, born out of barter, supported by Mony, and perpetuated by currency, essentially has no reason to exist. In practice, nothing prevents humans from returning to the principles of social order and finally adopting the mode of exchange and means of exchange suitable for a worthy society. Until then, they will continue to reason as individuals rather than as citizens.

21 Only independent producers can still be considered as producers of durable or consumable goods. Even workers are not strictly producers since they do not produce anything on their own. In fact, workers, like any other employees, offer their services to the company and, indirectly, to society.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

It's precisely this individualistic mentality, inherent in the monetary system and Mony, that misleads and leads to confusion between the mentality of humans in this specific context and the profound nature of humans. Humans, like all animals, aspire only to live in peace and security. However, for humans, peace and security—i.e., the rights that society must guarantee them in return for their dedication—are not as straightforward as in other animals. Their rights are as extensive as their capacities, offering more opportunities. Not only does Mony infringe on their rights by annihilating Equality, but also currency, embodying their rights, forces individuals to dispute what they manage to secure. Therefore, how can humans, molded by individualism and compelled to clash with each other, not seem inherently bad?

You say, citizen, that humans would fight even if Mony didn't exist. But how can you know what the world (society) and humans would be like without it when you can't imagine for a moment that it could disappear and you are evidently incapable of extracting it from your reasoning? Despite your reluctance, the humans you claim to foresee are, in fact, those you have before your eyes—the humans subjected forever to the same laws (with the primary laws being those of Mony), the same conflicts, and therefore prone to the same passions and behaviors. You haven't demonstrated that humans would fight even without Mony; you have simply asserted baselessly that they are inherently bad and will always fight because they fight today. By invoking Mony and implying an analysis you hadn't made or made poorly, you attempted to impress, but you've only revealed your inability to face it since you consider it inconsequential.

It is, however, true that humans will always fight, not because they are inherently bad, but because it is natural for individuals to confront each other. The crucial question is on what level the confrontation takes place and whether it stems from a desire to harm the other or inherently generates harm, implying a malicious character. Mony, however, places the confrontation on the plane of rights. Therefore, the very lives of individuals are at stake. Considering that Mony enforces inequality, what can be the outcome? What kind of mentality can develop in a situation where everyone must assert their rights over others, where some are exploited by others who oppress them, with the former having almost nothing and the latter almost

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

everything, and so on? It would be naive to believe that a virtuous person could emerge from such a context! Conversely, one must be blind or exhibit boundless bad faith to claim that this context is unrelated to the negative opinion we hold of today's humans and that it would retain the same characteristics if removed. But even if we were to assume that humans could retain, in an entirely different context, the character and reflexes we know them for, would we still judge them as bad if their actions no longer had the same consequences—in other words, if individuals could no longer harm each other on the plane of rights?

In any case, citizen, the question here is not whether humans are good or bad, whether the system makes them vicious, or if another system could make them virtuous (although that is to be hoped for). We are not gathered here to discuss the nature of humans or to make humans better. Instead, we are here to examine the crimes of Mony. We do not accuse it in the name of morality but in the name of justice. We primarily accuse Mony, as citizens, of annihilating Equality and social order, of stripping us of our citizenship, and of assaulting our dignity.

Mrs. Weathervane: But how can men be equal when they are naturally different?

Men are indeed different and will always be so. There is nothing in nature that is identical in every respect to another sample of the same species. Neither animals nor humans escape this universal law. However, the natural differences between individuals should not come into play within the group, which is precisely formed so that each of its members can avoid the drawbacks of solitude and the dangers of nature. You cannot speak of Equality, that is, refer to Rights, Citizens, and the state of Society, and at the same time, invoke the differences between men, that is, between individuals,

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

as if they were always in a state of Nature, as if they were not Citizens. It is because individuals have no Rights in the state of Nature that they associate, that they form Societies. As we have already explained, there are Rights in Society only because the individuals who are part of it, the Citizens, have duties towards each other, the same duties, so that they mutually guarantee the same Rights. A group, a Society, a City, a political association is therefore based on the fundamental Principle of Equality among its Citizens in Duties and Rights, although each Citizen, as an individual, is naturally, that is, obviously, different from others, as everyone knows, since it cannot be otherwise.

This classic reflection that natural differences (among men) make Equality in Rights (among Citizens) impossible not only betrays ignorance of what a Right is but, more importantly, ignorance that there are several levels of Rights (and Duties). Indeed, there are fundamental Duties and Rights, indirect Duties and Rights, and specific Duties and Rights.

Equality makes sense, concerning Duties, only at the level of fundamental Duties, while it takes its full meaning, regarding Rights, only at the level of indirect Rights. Invoking the differences between individuals implies referring to their capabilities; it implies that they do not all do the same thing and cannot all do the same thing. This is true. But it does not matter, as the specific skills of Citizens only come into play at the level of indirect Duties. In short, the fundamental Duty of Citizens is to participate in the life of the City. The way they participate is an indirect Duty. Whatever they do, and for whatever reason, the important thing, in the eyes of the City, is that they participate according to what it defines as participation and thus fulfill their fundamental Duty. It is the act of participating, not the manner of participating, that ensures individuals the City's recognition of their Citizen status and the Rights that Citizenship implies. Moreover, it is in the interest of the City, and therefore of all Citizens, that each fulfills their fundamental Duty in a different way. Undoubtedly, it is impossible for all Citizens to engage in the same activity due to the diversity of their talents, tastes, etc., but would the opposite even be desirable? No! We see, therefore, that the natural differences between men are not an obstacle to Equality in Rights among Citizens, that these differences are even a blessing, and we feel how insidious or ridiculous

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

it is to claim or imply that Equality requires the uniformity of individuals, an unattainable and, moreover, undesirable uniformity.

But we must now examine your reflection, citizen, from the perspective of Rights. You say that men cannot be equal because they are different. You imply that, due to their respective activities and the different (indirect) Duties they fulfill, they cannot and should not benefit in return from the same thing—in fact, the same Rights, which depend on Society. We have shown that this reasoning does not hold. We must still show how much it is influenced by Money.

An individual has Rights because he is a Citizen, and he is a Citizen when he participates in the life of the City according to what it considers participation. In other words, Rights are linked to belonging to the City, to the status of Citizen, to Citizenship. However, as much as the fundamental Duty of Citizens is to participate in the life of the City, their fundamental Right is to benefit from its blessings. These blessings are the result of the Duties fulfilled by all Citizens. When Citizens participate in the life of the City, it results in the production of goods or services that all Citizens have the Right to enjoy, to which all Citizens have the Right to access. This Right of access is an indirect Right, as it derives from the fundamental Right to enjoy the blessings of the City, and it is equal for all Citizens since it is linked to Citizenship. This is what the Principles of the social order prescribe; this is what Mony and currency contradict.

By definition, a means of exchange allows exercising the Right of access to the market where goods and services are, so to speak, brought together. This is not a problem in itself. But today, the means of exchange that is currency alone embodies this right. It is the monetary units that confer the power to access the market or to consume, not Citizenship. Therefore, money not only contradicts the Principles by dissociating this Right from Citizenship but also annihilates Citizenship itself by imposing inequality in rights between individuals who can no longer objectively and honestly be called Citizens. Thus, by saying that men cannot be equal because they are different, you attribute inequality in rights (especially the right of access to the market) between "Citizens" to the natural differences that exist between individuals.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

You observe an effect whose true cause eludes you, and in doing so, you endorse the order, or rather the disorder, established by Mony.

Imagine, jurors citizens, that the right to access the market is linked to Citizenship itself, that individuals can consume as Citizens and not as holders of a quantity of units (of any name) embodying this right. Imagine that all Citizens are inevitably equal in Rights, as they should be. They would still be different as individuals. But with Equality then being unshakable, could one still invoke these natural differences to try to restore inequality without looking like an idiot or a frustrated tyrant? What else could one gain from it? Everyone would have to come to terms with it and resign themselves to Equality in the same way that absurd reasons are put forward today by those who capitulate to Mony to justify inequality. It would then be evident, for Citizens equal in Rights, aware of the Principles of the social order and free from capitalist prejudices, that inequality was linked to the existence of Mony and that differences in fortunes, supposedly reflecting differences between individuals and their personal merits, were themselves attributable to the existence of currency.

Mrs. Weathervane: Citizen accuser, you mentioned that Rights exist only within the City. But men have rights by their very essence as humans! "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights!"

Citizen Weathervane, in two observations, you have shown all the inconsistency of which men are proudly capable! You support everything and its opposite! Initially resigned to the accomplished fact, you cited the natural differences between men as a pretext to justify social inequality among "Citizens," and now, subscribing to a formula as famous as it is ridiculous, you demand the innate Equality among men! You forget that Rights only exist if they are generated by someone and recognized by someone else. Rights cannot be innate or natural²² insofar as they must not only be generated by a

22 The Universal Declaration of Human and Citizen Rights of 1789 indeed advocates the theory of natural rights. "The Representatives of the French People, constituted in National Assembly, considering that ignorance, forgetfulness, or contempt of human rights are the sole causes of public miseries and governmental corruption, have resolved to set forth in a solemn Declaration the natural, inalienable, and sacred rights of Man..." (Preamble) "The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of Man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression." (Article II) "Liberty consists in the ability to do anything that does

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Duty (or a bundle of Duties) towards a Society but also be recognized and guaranteed as such by this Society²³. What is a Declaration of Rights, if not a proclamation by "Society" of the Rights it recognizes for its Citizens, or even for men in general, and proof that Rights do not exist without this recognition (which is not enough to guarantee them)?

Men have no Rights by nature. Only Citizens can have Rights (in the true sense of the term). However, one is not born a Citizen; one becomes a Citizen. You become a Citizen by fulfilling the Duties that the City imposes on each of its Citizens. It is only when they are recognized as Citizens by the City that it recognizes and guarantees them Rights, and this guarantee is ensured by all the Citizens, more precisely by the fact that Citizens have Duties towards each other. This is how, for example, the security of individuals within a Society is ensured by collective force, in other words, by the combined forces of the Citizens.

Rights, therefore, are the prerogative of Citizens, individuals who fulfill their Duties towards a Society, which implies that humans have no Rights solely by virtue of being born or existing. An infant is not a Citizen. It does not fulfill Duties towards the City, nor does it have an awareness of having Rights. However, even though an infant is not a Citizen, its parents have natural duties towards it, the duties that every parent owes to their offspring. Furthermore, since infants and children have the potential to become future

not harm others; thus, the exercise of the natural rights of each individual has no limits other than those that ensure other members of society enjoy these same rights. These limits can only be determined by law." (Article IV)

23 One cannot agree with the statement by Florence Gauthier, who, in "Triumph and Death of Natural Law in Revolution, 1789 - 1795 - 1802" (Puf, 1992, p. 100), declares: "To the 'natural rights of man and citizen,' the new concept of 'rights of man in society' was substituted [by the declaration of rights of May 29, 1793, buried by the events of June 1 and 2 of the same year and replaced by the one adopted on June 23]. Here, it is society, the political order that grants rights to the citizen and no longer nature. Here, the autonomy of the political over ethics is affirmed. To eliminate the idea of natural law is to break with the humanistic purpose of political association, which is to realize human rights by compelling governmental powers themselves to submit to this purpose." It is not implied that purely social rights are a gratuitous assertion, nor that this conception breaks with the humanistic purpose of political association. It is the natural rights that result from a gratuitous assertion, and proponents of natural law do not have the exclusive claim to humanism, especially since they advocate rights that either have no substance without society, proceed from a reaction to the monetary system (hence financial considerations) or bourgeois law (hence the emphasis on property), or derive from the act of political association (but are unfounded as they are), neglecting others that only the logic of political association allows to be posited. In other words, the concept of natural rights does not adequately define all the Citizen's Rights due to insufficient consideration of social relations. In fact, Florence Gauthier makes the classic mistake of considering the rights as defined by the bourgeoisie as the only rights that can be defined outside the concept of natural rights. (The same reaction leading to the same mistake is made regarding duties.) However, if the bourgeoisie rejected the concept of natural rights to secure their interests and abuses, they did not proclaim the Rights directly resulting from the act of political association and the Principles of social order. Thus, with natural law and bourgeois law being the only existing conceptions of law, the Rights according to the Principles of social order, Rights in all their extent, in all the rigor of social logic, have still not been posited.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Citizens, the City may make it a duty to protect, educate, instruct, etc.²⁴ them, duties that partly or wholly fall upon the parents, who are, in a sense, on the front line regarding them. Thus, without directly possessing Rights, a child—until it freely joins a City and becomes a Citizen—can enjoy the attention and protection of the City. In practice, it can have rights, but they are neither the Rights of a Citizen nor Rights in the strict sense. They are not rights earned through actions or bestowed by Nature but rather rights owed to the City's benevolence. Misunderstanding the nature of these rights is perilous, as it leads to or results from the dissociation of Duties and Rights, a dissociation that leads to arbitrariness and inequality under the pretext of humanity, which is the height of imprudence, not to say absurdity!

However, this first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Citizen of 1789 that you cite, Citizen, also presents a major danger in what is considered its greatest merit—its universal character.

Man being of a sociable nature, all humans live or tend to live in society. The *raison d'être* of any society is to ensure the security of its members. It is this security that sociable animals, driven like all animals by the instinct of self-preservation, seek when they associate with certain members of their species. The fundamental Duties and Rights of Citizens, i.e., the Principles of political association, directly and logically stem from the *raison d'être* of society. Therefore, they are identical regardless of the society, and in this sense, one can say they are universal. However, while the Principles of social order are universal and the fundamental Duties and Rights of the Citizen remain unchanged from one City to another, indirect and specific Duties and Rights are unique to each society. The same Principle cannot receive a uniform application everywhere. These variations depend on the capabilities of the animal species in question and the evolution of capabilities within a given society. Thus, what a City can concretely guarantee its Citizens is different from what another City can guarantee its own, even if what each

24 "The City can make it a duty..." The phrase may be surprising, but it is accurate. Because it would be incorrect to say that the City has the Duty to protect (...) children. A City has true Duties only towards its Citizens. Infants, once weaned, could very well be expelled, as some animal species do. Without being expelled, children could be neglected and left to their own devices. Worse, they could be exploited, as was done until the 19th century in Europe, as is still done today in many countries. The attitude towards children depends on the mentality of the time. Therefore, it cannot be said that Society has (by nature) Duties towards children because, in the best case, it is Society itself that imposes duties towards them. Furthermore, note that, just as the rights of children are not Rights (in the strict sense), the duties that Society feels towards them are not Duties (in the strict sense) because they do not stem from the act of political association, they are not prescribed by the Principles of social order, but are at the discretion of Society, which explains why they evolve.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

guarantees falls under the same Principle. Similarly, what a City can and must guarantee its Citizens at one time is different from what that same City can and must guarantee them at another time. Conversely, the Rights that all Citizens of a given City can claim on behalf of a Principle depend on the capabilities of that City and the Duties fulfilled by those Citizens, and thus vary between Cities. A native of the Amazon cannot claim the same Rights within his tribe as a French Citizen. Even if Citizens of two Cities can claim the same Rights, given that their Cities have the same development, they can only address their respective Cities. Thus, Citizens of the same City can and must be equal in Rights (fundamental and indirect), but Equality among Citizens of different Cities makes no sense. Therefore, Rights are undeniably linked to the quality of being a Citizen and not to that of being Human. This will still be true on the day when Citizenship is global, even if, with all humans being Citizens, it will probably be even more difficult for them to conceive that they are not Citizens by nature and that their Rights are not natural.

Finally, Rights are and will always be the counterpart of Duties. To enjoy the Rights recognized by the City, one must fulfill the Duties imposed by it. Now, if there is one innate thing, it is free will²⁵. Every individual, faced with their Duties, always has the possibility of evading them or, worse, prevaricating. In the first case, they are not a Citizen and have no Rights; in the second, they betray the City and expose themselves to the loss of all their Rights. Thus, a detainee is not the equal in Rights of a Citizen. They are not or are no longer a Citizen (at least for the duration of serving their sentence)! In what kind of spirit could this article have germinated that so blatantly defies common sense? Knowing that it was the product of a collective and elitist reflection and that humans still repeat it two centuries later (without believing in it anymore) is hardly reassuring about their discernment! But everything can be understood. This article was drafted by men eager to overthrow the despotism of divine right, and who, to escape one excess, fell into another, that of natural law. Since then, this error and this kind of error have been committed by all. Demagoguery is the trap into which philanthropy too often falls.

25 The term "free" does not refer to civic freedom, Freedom as a Right, contrary to the confusion caused by the use of the same term in the first article of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Citizen ("Men are born free and equal in rights.").

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Upon closer examination, this error was due to Mony. It was a philosophical retreat in the face of the inherently unequal logic of any monetary system. People attacked inequality, but they did not reject Mony, not even currency, and while hoping to extract the universal principles of RIGHTS, they reasoned without any logic²⁶. More precisely, they remained faithful to monetary logic and deliberately or unconsciously betrayed social logic. If, based on this single article, this explanation is doubtful, articles XIII, XIV, and XVII of the same Declaration²⁷ confirm it. Mony had to preoccupy them so that, in this solemn moment, speaking of abilities (in the sense of fortune), expenses, contribution, proportion, assessment, collection, and indemnities, they would endorse its existence and renew its fatal powers. That Mony, inseparable from these terms, is an artificial given, and that currency is by nature an unequal and tyrannical factor, did not cross their minds! On the contrary! They integrated them into their reasoning as untouchable parameters, as natural data.

But what do financial considerations have to do in the midst of a supposedly universal and egalitarian Declaration of Rights? On one hand, it is logical to mix them with questions of rights, since it is through money that essential rights and many others pass in a monetary system. It is therefore both tacitly recognizing the link between rights and money, and ignoring or pretending not to know that money and Equality are incompatible. On the other hand, it is absurd to evoke them, since financial problems obviously concern only subjects of Mony, individuals living in monetary systems. It is therefore wrongly assuming that all people, wherever they are, are in this case and that all generations have been or will be forever. In short, despite its commendable intentions, historical significance, symbolic aspect, and even its merits, this Declaration, too marked by temporal concerns and data, cannot claim to be universal. Only aiming to alleviate injustices (especially the

26 Thus, Property, which is only a specific Right, was placed among fundamental Rights (articles II and XVII), on an equal footing with Liberty or Security, while not a word is said about the fundamental Right to enjoy the benefits of Society, hence the indirect Right to access the market, a right that largely determines the freedom of Citizens, a right that must therefore be equal for all Citizens and from which the Right to Property precisely derives. Men were declared equal in rights, but nothing was planned to ensure that Citizens were actually equal.

27 Article XIII – "For the maintenance of public force, and for administrative expenses, a common contribution is essential: it must be equally distributed among all citizens, according to their abilities." — Art. XIV – "All Citizens have the right to ascertain, by themselves or through their representatives, the necessity of public contribution, to consent to it freely, to follow its use, and to determine its amount, basis, collection, and duration." — Art. XVII – "Property being an inviolable and sacred right, no one can be deprived of it, except when public necessity, legally established, obviously requires it, and under the condition of just and prior compensation."

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

shadow cast at the time on the bourgeoisie by the nobility), it neither perceives nor reveals the cause of inequality, Money, and turns Equality, highlighted in the first article, into an empty word.

Mr Blind: To counter the inequality generated by Money, it would suffice for the City to impose equal incomes! It is therefore people who do not want to be equal!

Citizen, how can you, in two sentences, say two contradictory things without realizing the enormity? If Mony generates inequality, a monetary system is, by definition, incompatible with Equality. Moreover, history shows Man progressing toward social progress, hostile to privileges, tyranny, exploitation of Man by Man, etc. The fact that Equality has still not been achieved does not authorize denying the will and efforts made by people in this direction! The whole question is why their efforts have not been successful.

You still suggest, in response, that Man is bad and that Mony is innocent; we say straightforwardly that Mony is the major obstacle to Equality. How can you continue not to see it when the spotlight is on it? We understand that men oppressed directly by other men and forced to confront them did not think of attributing to Mony the deep cause of their woes? They could not defy Mony, which they did not conceive as an enemy and which, for various reasons, they could not have defeated anyway! But do you still have this excuse, living under a regime as "democratic" as Mony allows and being oppressed only by it and its lackeys? The reflex of our ancestors was justified by the impression that other men alone were responsible for the tyranny they suffered. Today you have the same reflex while Mony reigns undisputed and openly! Kings, powerful people, bourgeois, intellectuals, and many others fell in vain under the axe. Whom do you still want to eliminate? How many more victims do you need to finally learn from history? Certainly, citizen, you have not suggested

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

anything like that, but among those who nowadays aspire to Equality while sharing your blindness, some undoubtedly think of it, and many ignore that this is the path into which the force of circumstances would drag them if they had the opportunity to put their ideas to the test!

You say, citizen, that, to achieve Equality, "it would suffice for the City to impose equal incomes." It is time to expose the principles of the functioning of money, the fruit of Mony. They are two in number.

Firstly, it operates on the principle of communicating vessels. As a means of exchange that is exchanged, it circulates from hand to hand, passing from one individual to another, so that for there to be money here, it must be taken from there. This explains, for example, why the State, needing financial means, imposes taxes; why it is obliged to reduce expenses in one area when it wants to favor another; and why the announcement of a tax cut either leads to the sacrifice of public services (at least the reduction of the budget allocated to them) or the emergence of new forms of levies. Thus, politicians who do not tackle Mony are reduced to managing inequality in their own way, not solving it. They qualify themselves modestly as managers, but they are only jugglers, acrobats.

Money operates, finally, according to the principle of attraction. Insofar as each monetary unit embodies rights, the more an individual possesses, the richer he is, the more rights he has, the more power he has over things and people, the more he has the opportunity and means to enrich himself further. All doors open to the rich; all or almost all remain closed for the poor. That's why "money goes to money" and how the "social gap" widens from generation to generation.

It goes without saying that the very functioning of money, combined with the consequences of an exchange system based on the notion of (market) value, does not allow the monetary mass to naturally distribute itself equally among "Citizens." The "Society" cannot, whether it wants to or not, ensure equal incomes for everyone. It is therefore ridiculous to consider an egalitarian project destined to fail as the easiest thing to undertake, and then attribute a lack of egalitarian will to people against all evidence. Even if the passion of people for Equality were dormant or difficult to detect in ordinary times, that

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

would not negate it, as it would be too much to overlook the resignation to which Mony forces them.

Furthermore, citizen, by saying that "it would suffice for the City to impose equal incomes," you not only underestimate the inevitable effects of Mony and the functioning of money but also imply impractical solutions. Indeed, how to establish equal incomes? Since this balance cannot be achieved or maintained naturally, the State would necessarily have to intervene. There would then be two possible solutions (in appearance): 1) the State should define a standard income and ensure it to all "Citizens" by taking from the rich to give to the poor, by prohibiting getting richer beyond the authorized threshold, 2) all "Citizens" should be paid directly and equally by the State²⁸. But, in either case, in addition to the technical, political, economic difficulties, and human resistances that would ultimately thwart all calculations and cause any such experiment to fail²⁹, do you not feel the absurdity of such systems? If it is accepted that Mony generates wealth and poverty, and if one aspires to Equality, why cling to Mony whose negative effects are acknowledged? Why not eradicate the cause of inequality directly instead of getting lost in endless and grotesque juggling? For how can one imagine for a moment that these systems would be happy and sustainable? Is it not the height of demagoguery to want to retain the monetary system while removing its inherent logic, however catastrophic it may be? Is it not adding incoherence to injustice? Moreover, would it not be inflicting on people the torture of Tantalus to perpetuate in them the thirst for gold without ever allowing them to quench it?

Furthermore, citizen, by focusing on income inequality, you have lost sight of the fact that it is just one problem among an infinite number of others also related to Mony and the materialization of rights through currency! Assuming that it is possible for a state to level wages, how would that prevent individuals from saving, stealing, or getting rich through means other than work? In what way would individuals and the state be liberated from capitalist

28 There are therefore three possible systems: at one extreme, purely capitalo-liberal systems in which, under the pretext of Freedom and Property, the State does not intervene, at least not in favor of Equality; at the other extreme, so-called communist systems, in which, under the pretext of anti-capitalism, the State is everywhere, Freedom and Equality nowhere; finally, halfway between the two, systems in which, under the pretext of humanity, the welfare state adopts "small measures" that do not eradicate inequalities but preserve certain freedoms (which are not Freedom).

29 A similar experiment, although less ambitious, was attempted during the French Revolution under the name of the Maximum (prices and wages). It faced numerous difficulties and even encountered opposition from those who had advocated for its implementation.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

prejudices and financial constraints³⁰? How would such a state, also having Mony as its only lever, address problems differently than any ordinary capitalist state? And, since we are talking about wages, would this state be better equipped than capitalist states to provide income to all individuals who contribute to the life of the "City" in a form other than work and who are thus Citizens?

Finally, citizen, the main reason why your assumption is unacceptable, and consequently your conclusion, is that income equality is not Equality in Rights. Certainly, money embodies rights, but these rights are those that the monetary system can conceive, and they are not Rights in the true sense of the term. In inequality, speaking of rights is a misuse of language because they have nothing in common with those enjoyed by Citizens in Equality, which is the only true state of Rights. A monetary income confers purchasing power, that is, the right to access the market. But this right is in no way the Right of access that Citizens must genuinely enjoy.

Firstly, this Right is an indirect Right since it stems from the fundamental Rights to Security and Liberty, in other words, the fundamental Right for a Citizen to benefit from the blessings of their City, and must therefore, like any indirect Right, be equal for all Citizens—a equality that money cannot

30 The most daring yet still inconsistent theory is arguably that of distributive economics, also known as the abundance economy. It advocates for a monthly payment to all citizens by the state, providing an equal income in the form of credits – a currency that wouldn't be exchanged but deducted from citizens' accounts based on their purchases and subsequently destroyed. This theory seems to address many problems on the surface, but, like its proposed currency, it lacks a solid foundation.

The theory of distributive economics doesn't align with the logic of money and exchange. The concept of market value, which we call money (Mony), emerges from the exchange of goods. Money, in turn, supports barter and gives rise to currency – units of value exchanged for goods or services. However, the credits proposed by distributive economics wouldn't be exchanged; therefore, they wouldn't logically follow from the concept of money. Nonetheless, they would still be used to purchase goods or services with market values, even though the concept of market value would no longer be relevant.

This raises questions: Why would things still have prices when sellers have no incentive to charge for their goods? In this scenario, prices would tend toward zero, supposedly fixed incomes toward infinity, and the system would collapse. So, the question arises: Why retain this kind of means of exchange when, in fact, rights would be conferred by citizenship? The answer is simple: it's a matter of capitalist prejudices. Those who challenge everything, including money, may remain trapped in the belief that the concept of value (market value) is necessary for exchange – in other words, in the belief in money. Even though they contest the mechanisms of money and undermine its *raison d'être* (money itself), they continue to view things through the lens of market value. Consequently, they preserve money, imagine an implausible currency, and give birth to an artificial capitalist system that, at the first opportunity, would likely revert to natural capitalism. This becomes evident when considering that distributive economics, despite aiming for equality, still proposes differentiating salaries based on activities, perpetuating profit as a motivation factor.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

establish, except in dreams. This Right must also be constant and equal at all times (as long as the individual is a Citizen), constancy and permanence that even a State that manages to equalize incomes could not ensure because it is in the nature of money to be exchanged, and the rights it confers are therefore depleted as they are exercised. Furthermore, the Right of access must be conferred by Citizenship and attached to the specific Citizen, which goes against the anonymous and transient nature of monetary units. Finally, an indirect Right has no inherent limits. It is externally and naturally bounded by the Citizen's use of it, by the exercise of this same Right by other Citizens, by the respect for the Rights of others, by the nature of things, and possibly by the law³¹. The Right of access must, therefore, be indefinite or theoretically unlimited, which is logical since it is directly conferred by Citizenship that cannot be quantified. But this logic is contradicted by money, which limits the access right of individuals to the amounts they have, thus artificially bounding it before it is even exercised. Once again, Mony assassinates the Principles!

Mr. Neuron: But, Mr. Accuser, Mony allows assigning value to things! Without it, no values!

Citizen, you are confusing the notion of value with that of market value. Nothing inherently has value. It is people who assign value to things, and it is Mony (or currency) that attributes or allows them to attribute a price. However, just because something does not have a price does not mean it has no value. More precisely, an individual does not need the market to decree the price of something for that thing to have value or interest in their eyes. There are things that only have value for the individual. Conversely, prices often do not reflect the value that individuals attribute to things in question. We see, therefore, that the disappearance of Mony, currency, and prices

31 For example, the right to move freely, derived from liberty, is constrained by the citizen's desire to move, the means of transportation available, the presence of fellow citizens on the path, physical obstacles such as walls, ditches, or steep terrain, the existence of predetermined paths and roads, compliance with traffic rules for motorists, and ultimately by laws that may regulate speed, direction of travel, restrict access to certain places, etc.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

would not lead to the disappearance of values. However, these values would then be subjective, unofficial; they would be conceived by individuals, not dictated by the market; in short, they would be just, no longer arbitrary.

Moreover, what are prices, these supposedly indispensable values? We have just said that they do not correspond to the personal and indefinable value that individuals attribute to things or would attribute if they were free to do so. But do they even correspond to the things they are supposed to determine the value of? Who has never said, "It's (too) expensive for what it is!" or "It's a steal!"? These two expressions, which illustrate extreme cases, clearly reveal what intermediate cases difficultly allow us to realize, namely that prices have no relation to goods. To be convinced of this, one only needs to know how they are formed.

According to classical economic theory, prices result from the "law" of supply and demand, that is, the convergence between the interest of the company to sell an object produced in a certain quantity at a certain price and the possibility for consumers to buy at that price. The fact that the price of an object fluctuates according to the quantity produced or sold says enough that this price does not determine the intrinsic value of the product per unit since it varies according to criteria that are unrelated to it. Another version of this law of Supply and Demand is to see the seller (or producer) and the consumer bargaining and agreeing on the price. It is therefore evident again that, to the extent that the price depends, on the one hand, on the desire or need to buy and the purchasing power of the consumer, on the other hand, on the financial needs, the willingness to sell, and the character of the seller, it is therefore evident, we say, that a price variable to infinity does not reflect the so-called intrinsic value of objects, that an object simply has no intrinsic value. In short, it is not the object that induces a price: it is the price exposed to all hazards that determines the momentary market value of the object, a value unrelated to the object itself.

But these two versions of how prices are established are largely false. Generally, the price is set in advance by the seller, based on their perception of their interests and greed, in short, on their policy. The considerations and situation of buyers do not come into play. It's take it or leave it. The price of the same object varies, therefore, according to the sellers and their moods,

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

proving once again that prices do not emanate from the objects themselves, that they do not in any way translate an intrinsic value to the objects.

Thus, what is expensive today may not necessarily be so tomorrow, and what is cheap now may be worth a fortune later. Similarly, what is rare is not necessarily expensive, and what is expensive is not necessarily rare. People sometimes have the possibility to give but are generally forced to sell. The case of the gift is therefore particular. When it concerns a good bought by the giver, it implies that the giver is not trying to reimburse themselves. When it concerns a good inherited or found by the giver, it implies that they are not trying to profit from it. In either case, the giver must be relatively deaf to the commands of Mony and liberated from capitalist reflexes. But, in general, people are caught in the gears of the monetary system, and things must have a minimum price that is their cost for companies or their purchase cost for all kinds of resellers so that their sale, failing to make them gain anything, does not make them lose anything.

For a merchant, a simple intermediary, the cost of purchase is the amount he paid to acquire the object before reselling it in turn at this minimum price³². But a merchant must live from his activity. At this price, he must therefore add a profit margin: the price of his time and work. At the price thus obtained, he can add a new profit margin with the aim, no longer of living, but of getting rich. In essence, these two profit margins are set purely arbitrarily, according to the appetite of the merchants and the price at which they estimate their work. The sum of all these prices constitutes the selling price, "the price of objects." However, the price of their merchandise, which corresponds to the cost of purchase for merchants, comes from the same process. Suppliers also set their prices based on their own cost of purchase and the profit margins they want to generate. Suppliers of suppliers do the same. Therefore, a cost of purchase corresponds no more than a selling price to the prices of things, to their value, but to the profit margins that the various intermediaries have successively agreed upon.

The same goes for companies, which, in a monetary system, are less designed to produce wealth than to enrich the bosses. In this case, it is the

³² We simplify. In reality, the purchase cost for a merchant is composed not only of the price at which they bought their goods but also the cost of transportation, storage, presentation, and the taxes imposed by the state, etc. These are costs imposed on the seller and ultimately borne by the customer. It is, in essence, a cost of production.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

boss who plays the role of a merchant and sets the prices. The difference lies in the fact that the margins in question merge and are, depending on the size of the company and the nature of the production, either included in the cost of production or deducted from profits. The overall minimum price of the company's products (or services), the cost of production, corresponds to the cost of purchasing raw materials and other goods, plus the cost of production (machines, energy, losses, taxes, rent, etc.), the cost of employee labor (gross salaries and taxes), that is, the added value³³, and finally various expenses (clothing, works council, travel, meals, shares, bribes, rent, etc.). Unless the boss considers themselves an employee and includes their margins in the cost of labor, they earn nothing if the company sells its products at this minimum price that only compensates for its expenses. They must then inflate prices to create a profit margin. We see, therefore, that selling prices are partly used to pay people, people involved directly or indirectly in the company, and partly to pay for things. But these things that represent a cost for the company have a price themselves only because the companies that produce them must pay their own employees and suppliers.

In summary, it is people who cost, who have a price; they are the ones who are actually paid, not the objects. Things only have a price to allow companies to pay their employees who, in turn, with their salaries, can buy products from other companies which, with their revenues, will pay their employees, and so on. Prices, therefore, do not reflect the value of things³⁴ but essentially represent the cost of labor, so that if citizens were remunerated differently than with money and consumed through another means of exchange, prices would have no reason to exist, and people would not suffer from the disappearance of the notion of market value, which is only an illusion.

33 We should also have mentioned the costs of management, maintenance, distribution, promotion, etc. These are costs that, essentially, correspond to salaries paid by the company to employees, whether its own or those of other companies. These costs relate to human labor and are part of or can be assimilated to the cost of labor proper.

34 Let's put it better: not only do prices not reflect the value of things, but things only have market value, i.e., a price, because people believe they should have one. This belief (Money) does not apply to a particular object; it concerns them all in a general way. As they believe that everything has a price (payable in currency in a monetary system), people anticipate the act of purchase, believe they will need money, and demand money in return for their work. As a result, things truly have a price.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

However, the uninterrupted sequence of cause and effect allows us to take the effect for the cause. We say that things have a price (effect) because people are paid in money (cause). However, it may seem just as true to say that people need money (effect) because things have a price (cause). But this reasoning has only the appearance of truth; it is correct from an individual point of view but false in the absolute sense. An effect disappears with its cause. To stop paying people with money, therefore, to establish a new method of remuneration and access to the market or things, eliminates prices de facto. On the other hand, it is impossible to eliminate prices as long as people are paid in money, as long as companies need to obtain it through the sale of their products. The price of things is therefore indeed the consequence, and not the origin, of the remuneration of labor in money. Yet, those who support the impossibility of eliminating the latter make this fallacious reasoning without realizing it. Thus, their grand discourses on the necessity of value rest on an assumption that has none itself. What irony!

Nevertheless, things have a price in a monetary system, and even for a moment, this price determines what is called their (market) value. We have seen that this value means nothing regarding the objects themselves. We must add that fixed prices mean nothing in themselves compared to individuals. Indeed, what does the same price mean for variously wealthy individuals? Except in the case of a zero price that actually makes the object or service accessible to everyone, any price takes on a different value depending on individuals and their wealth. Thus, €1,000 represents 100% of the income for someone earning €1,000, but only 10% of the income for someone earning €10,000. In the first case, these €1,000 represent all the means of living for the person concerned; in the second, only a part. In fact, prices that supposedly set the value of things establish, for each thing, as many relative values as there are individuals or income levels. However, since it is impossible for prices to be proportional to income or wealth³⁵, they are generally fixed. Therefore, everything becomes more and more expensive for increasingly poor individuals, and vice versa for the rich. It is also inaccurate to say that certain things are becoming more expensive when, in fact, their price makes them purely inaccessible to many budgets.

³⁵ Even a state that acknowledges the principle of a proportional tax on wealth is incapable of applying it to the letter, as it imposes income tax in brackets. Moreover, except for direct taxes, it never takes into account the level of income. It therefore violates the "fair" principle it has itself recognized.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Finally, the height of irony is that the very value of a monetary unit is changeable. Whether the medium of money is metallic, so that the official value of a coin corresponds to the value of the quantity of metal it contains, or whether the money is fiduciary, so that its value is pure convention, its real value is not fixed. The value of a monetary unit depends on what it allows one to buy. Its value increases when prices fall and decreases when they increase. Similarly, it increases when the money supply decreases and decreases when the money supply increases. As for metallic currencies, their real value depends on the quantity of metal available in the country. The more a country is rich in metal, the less value that metal has, the less the coins made of that metal have value, and vice versa. The case of Spain, enriched and then ruined by the gold of the Americas, is well known. We see, therefore, that, from whatever angle we approach the question of prices and value (market), these concepts have no consistency and exist only for Mony. They mean nothing for objects and an infinity of things for individuals. Objects cost but are worth nothing. There is no fair price; there are only prices, prices that impress and stop only the poor! The so-called values of the monetary system are much more useful for oppression than for exchanges! Remove Mony and its hypocritical values: true values remain, those that individuals accord themselves and that cannot be measured!

Mr. Blind: Alright, but how can we exchange without the notion of value?

Citizen, the very way you pose your question prevents you from answering it. Instead of asking how to exchange without the notion of (market) value, first ask yourself why we resort to it. You will then understand that you only conceive a certain form of exchange and that you are a prisoner of this conception and its logic.

So, why do we resort to the notion of market value, and what purpose does it serve? It serves to assign a value to things so that they can be exchanged for other things or sums of money of equivalent value. This notion allows

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

individuals to exchange with each other, to engage in direct or indirect barter (through the use of money), which is logical since it originated from the practice of barter itself. In fact, it is inevitable that individuals who exchange with each other resort to the notion of value, and inversely, resorting to the notion of value is symptomatic of the individualistic conception of monetary exchange. Thus, Citizen, when you ask how to exchange without the notion of (market) value, you are actually asking how individualistic exchange can exist without it. You prove that you are trapped in the individualistic conception of exchange where the notion of value makes sense and is indeed necessary. In short, you are going in circles.

Contesting the necessity of the notion of market value (Mony) is therefore to contest the individualistic conception of exchange. But, on what grounds do we contest it? In the name of the very function of exchanges, in the name of their social dimension.

Barter, the origin of the notion of market value, does not involve individuals as Citizens. It is practiced between two parties but assumes that all individuals produce and exchange, so they are independent in appearance but interdependent in reality. From the perspective of Principles, Society is annihilated since, instead of participating in the life of the City and thus fulfilling the first Duty of the Citizen towards it, individuals produce for themselves and no longer expect the City to guarantee them the Right that Citizens have to enjoy its benefits. Barter, however, requires a "Society" that recognizes producers' right to own their production since they must be owners to be able to exchange it. Failing to be justified by Principles, the practice of barter is acceptable when individuals are all small producers, especially since it is then technically inevitable and socially painless. But with evolution comes money, which allows for indirect barter and perpetuates the individualistic conception of exchange, even though it is stamped by a State, a symbol of "Society." It grants individuals equipped with it the right to participate in exchanges by accessing the market. "Society" still guarantees producers the ownership of their production, but this guarantee now only interests businesses, as individuals no longer produce anything alone, with a few exceptions. So, at present, there is a common denominator between barter and the monetary system and three fundamental differences.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

The common denominator is the individualistic conception of exchanges, the fact that "Citizens" are involved in exchanges only as individuals. The first difference is that individuals are no longer, especially today, independent producers but complementary workers; the second, which stems from the first, is that "Society" no longer plays the same role from the individuals' point of view: under barter, it guarantees them the right to property over their production; in the monetary system, it endorses the currency, which, distributed by businesses, confers on individuals the right to access the market. The third difference, a consequence of the first two, is that the goods that individuals derive from exchange are no longer someone's production, as no one produces anything alone anymore, but are, so to speak, withdrawn from the common product, the product of "Society," since everyone contributes to production. Thus, under barter, individuals exchange properties, rights; in a monetary system, the exchange results from individuals exercising rights generally obtained through work, somehow linked to their status as workers³⁶, and exercised with "Society." The nature of the exchange is therefore no longer the same.

So, even though money perpetuates the individualistic conception of exchanges, and the monetary system is theoretically an individualistic exchange system, individuals, in practice, no longer exchange directly or indirectly with each other, and the concept of market value no longer has a reason to exist. In other words, the way people exchange today no longer corresponds to their conception of exchange. Reality has evolved faster than mentalities, and Mony, the foundation of individualistic exchange, has become an anachronism.

People haven't realized it, but a revolutionary conception of exchange has developed under Mony and despite it. It's no longer about exchanges between individuals, but exchanges between the individual and "Society." It's no longer about exchanging objects for others but fulfilling duties towards "Society," via companies, to obtain rights in this "Society." There is a clear evolution in the right direction, towards the social dimension that exchange should never have lost. Certainly, Mony and its mechanisms do not allow us

³⁶ When salaries are standardized, defined by scales, individuals are not paid based on their work but according to their job, regardless of how they perform it. This is even more evident when considering the minimum wage set by law, intended to pay a large portion of workers equally despite the infinite variety of jobs they may have.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

to go further, that is, to link access to the market to Citizenship itself. But evolution will not stop, while Mony, itself, is coming to an end. The next step will inevitably be the annihilation of Mony and the disappearance of the concept of market value.

The question remains of how to exchange without the latter. In the absence of providing the solution here, let's at least establish the principle. Renouncing the concept of market value is to reject both the exchange of objects among themselves and the exchange between individuals, condemning both Mony and the monetary system and inequality in rights. It is, therefore, to adopt a radically different conception of exchange. We have just said that a revolutionary conception of exchange has appeared, although it is still imperfect. Derived from the exchange between individuals, it consists of the exchange between the individual and "Society." It is imperfect because it does not go to the end of social logic, being confined within the framework of monetary logic. But we can guess that this conception foreshadows that of the exchange between the Citizen and the City, an exchange that will consist, for the Citizen, in fulfilling his Duties towards the City and, for the City, in guaranteeing his Rights as a Citizen, including the right to enjoy its benefits and, consequently, to access the market. It is essentially the type of exchange in force today, except that individuals receive the right to access the market, materialized and denatured by money, not from the City but from their company. This right is limited and unequal, instead of being indefinite and equal, and they access the market, not as Citizens, but as holders of money.

Such is the mode of exchange prescribed by the Principles of the social order. We see, therefore, how unfounded are the ideas of those who believe that exchanging without resorting to money and the concept of market value would mean returning to barter, or who, because it is evident that certain objects cannot be exchanged for others, argue that a value standard is an absolute necessity. However, we have just shown that the direct or indirect exchange of objects between individuals is no longer the norm, and therefore, monetary exchange, based on the concept of value (born from barter), no longer inherently has a reason to exist, no more than a return to barter makes sense. However, there has been no backward step in evolution! Completely

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

doing away with the concept of market value would not be a return to the past. On the contrary, this evolution, made possible by ongoing developments (especially technological), would be a tremendous step forward! Humanity would finally discover Equality and its wonders, and realize the extent of the crimes of Mony.

Mr. Cupid: If citizens were equal, they would all have the same things!

Citizen, you forget that the equality in question applies to rights, and evidently, what you call "things" are goods, properties. You argue that having the same rights would mean having the same goods. This is inherently nonsensical.

In fact, you do not understand what Equality is. Citizens are equal in rights when, after all having fulfilled the same fundamental duties towards the City, it guarantees them the same fundamental and indirect rights. An indirect right is the possibility to do something; it is a freedom. In this case, the City must guarantee all its citizens the fundamental right to enjoy its benefits and the indirect right (or freedom) to access the market. This indirect right is equal for all citizens because it is conferred to them by their citizenship itself, and not by monetary units that certainly grant the right to access the market but only in proportion to the quantity of units individuals possess. Thus, today, the rich and the poor, unequal financially, unequal in the right to access the market and consequently unequal in rights altogether, cannot acquire the same things, and indeed, they do not have the same things. Inequality in rights implies significant differences in properties, which, a priori, may suggest that in equality, citizens would have the same things. However, this overlooks the fact that, although there is no equality among all individuals in a monetary "Society," individuals with the same income or receiving the same salary are, in a sense, equal in rights. Do these individuals, equal according to the monetary system, have the same things? No! Why would it be different if all individuals forming the Society, all citizens, were equal in rights?

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

That being said, there is a fundamental reason why citizens equal in rights cannot have the same things: by definition, rights are freedoms, and therefore, citizens are free to use them as they please, as long as they do not violate the rights of others. They exercise their rights based on their tastes, desires, needs, characters, etc., in other words, based on their personalities. The natural differences that exist between individuals are reflected in how they exercise their rights. Furthermore, the indirect right in question is the right to access the market. From the exercise of this right arises the right of ownership, i.e., the right to own goods withdrawn from the market, a particular right that citizens enjoy but for which the term "exercise" means nothing. It is, therefore, evident that citizens who exercise this right differently (to access the market), and thus withdraw different goods from the market, cannot ultimately be owners of the same goods.

There is a second reason why your remark, citizen, is ridiculous: even if a state decreed that citizens must possess the same things, it would not only be absurd but also impossible for it to realize its project. But first, why involve the state? Because we have just seen that natural differences between individuals naturally lead them, as citizens, to want to acquire different things, and only a state and its laws, a tyrannical state moreover, could contravene or hope to contravene this natural inclination. But a tyrannical state is incompatible with Equality, as it is engendered by inequality and, in turn, engenders inequalities by stripping the mass of "Citizens" of rights and freedoms for the benefit of a privileged minority. How long does it take for men with power to abuse it, especially when this power is boundless? It would indeed be absurd to want to constrain men, supposedly in the name of Equality, to possess the same things. For how to define what they should possess? How would the same definition suit everyone? Since men cannot agree on genres, styles, quantities, what interest would they have in the uniformity of properties, especially considering that only a tyrannical state could seek to establish it? What interest would the state itself have in a constraining enterprise for itself, without being happy for anyone? What economic interest would it have, since fixing the quantity, genre, and style of properties means limiting or even reducing production, artificially increasing it in certain areas, weakening or annihilating export capacity, prohibiting competition and perhaps imports, stifling initiative and creative genius? In

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

short, for this uniformity to be possible, even on paper, men would have to be clones, or even robots, and the rulers would have to be both virtuous and completely idiotic. This is to say that it is unfeasible. You see, citizen, that "equality" in goods is chimerical—imagining it is insupportable, seeking to establish it is criminal, and achieving it is impossible!

But your concern, citizen, is not only absurd in itself; it is also absurd in relation to our argument. Because we are prosecuting Mony, not the principle of exchange through a means. No one here contests the necessity of a means of exchange, even if money is not the one suitable for Equality. However, by definition, a means of exchange is a tool that allows individuals who possess it to access the market and withdraw goods as they see fit (or in proportion to their wealth, in the case of money). It follows that production is not authoritatively distributed by the state but is freely consumed (relatively free under money) by individuals. Therefore, even if a state were to dictate what "Citizens" can possess³⁷, not all would desire or have the same things. But this state would then be tyrannical, and there would be neither equality in rights nor equality in goods. For us, who do not compromise with Mony and inequality (in rights), for us, who do not consider a state democratic unless laws are literally ratified by the people, it is excluded that the state is tyrannical and that uniformity in goods is even considered. Knowing, moreover, that in Equality, the right to consume would be given not by a quantity of money but by Citizenship, and that this Citizenship would be asserted through a means of exchange—whose nature is of little importance here—we can affirm that truly equal citizens in rights would indeed be free to access the market, hence free to express their differences and would possess different things.

Finally, let us clarify that Equality does not proscribe Property and that, although all citizens have the same right to access goods present on the market, these goods become the private properties of those who have exercised their right and withdrawn them from the market. The recognition of the (particular) right to own goods³⁸ is essential because it is mainly through

37 A medium of exchange prevents the State from dictating to "Citizens" what they must own. The State can then only define what they can own.

38 The right to property does not extend to everything and anything. Stemming from the exercise of the right of access, which itself results from the duty to participate in the life of the City, it can only pertain to the collective fruits of the duty in question, in other words, to products. There are, of course, particular cases, but, in all cases, property requires, like any right, social recognition and guarantee. Nothing can be owned without the, at least tacit,

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

this right that citizens practically enjoy the (fundamental) right to benefit from the city's blessings. This recognition goes hand in hand with the acknowledgment of the necessity of a means of exchange since a means of exchange helps citizens exercise their right to access the market—a right that only makes sense if citizens then own the goods they have withdrawn from the market. Knowing that the city acknowledges the legitimacy of the right to property (or ownership) and deems the use of a means of exchange necessary not only dismisses the hypothesis that citizens equal in rights (indirect) could have the same things but also that the goods, once acquired by some, belong to all. These are also the effects of money, with the difference that the freedoms it confers vary according to the individuals' wealth and are not Freedom, and the properties it sanctifies, on everything and anything, are not Property, Freedom and Property having meaning as rights only in Equality.

Mr. Neuron: But if citizens were equal in rights regardless of their work, the arduous jobs would be deserted!

Is that all you've found, citizen, as a consideration to convince yourself that injustice is preferable to Equality? Is it with such arguments that you hope to confound the Principles? Stop, citizen, trying to pass for a sensible man instead of being a just one!

And first of all, who are you to decree that some jobs are more arduous than others? Each job has its advantages and disadvantages, and what you believe to be disadvantages are undoubtedly perceived by others as advantages! That some jobs are physically or morally harder than others does not make them inherently arduous jobs. What is arduous is to work a job that does not suit us. Arduousness is a matter of personal perspective!

However, we clearly see the jobs to which you are referring. These are tiring, dirty, mind-numbing, uninteresting, despised, and generally poorly paid jobs. Do you not already feel, citizen, all the contradiction, all the ridicule of your

agreement of society.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

reflection? You assume that these poorly paid jobs would be deserted if those who currently perform them became equals to their fellow citizens, in other words, if these same jobs provided more rights. Would it not be wiser to start by asking why some people work these jobs today? There are two possibilities: some choose them, following their inclinations or interests; others, for lack of talent or employment, have no choice, even if only temporarily. In short, no one really has a choice, and Mony does nothing to the matter, except to allow exploitation. On the other hand, Equality would not change their tastes or talents. The jobs you are thinking of would not be deserted as you claimed... So, what do you think individuals who perform these jobs would prefer: doing a "arduous" job, coupled with exploitation and accompanied by misery, or doing the same job while being recognized as full-fledged Citizens? Would not this change take away much of this so-called arduousness? Would it not, on the contrary, lead them to appreciate their condition more, to praise Equality, and to love the City, their homeland? It is therefore at least surprising that you turn the considerable improvement that Equality would bring to your "Fellow Citizens" into a disadvantage, and that, in doing so, you seem to praise the inequality that, according to you, can alone provide the jobs that repel you and that some occupy today without the exploitation and oppression they face revolt you.

But let us admit that over time and thanks to Equality, all citizens have access to education and turn away from certain jobs, thereby emphasizing the need to fill them and the unrecognized merit of those who perform them. Failing to replace humans with machines, the City would be forced to find solutions to attract citizens to these jobs. A first solution could be to offer additional benefits (but never in terms of purchasing power, which would be resorting, in another form, to capitalist solutions) to compensate or at least accept their drawbacks. Another, already less good than the first, could be to establish a kind of civil service so that all citizens, in turn, perform simple tasks in themselves but neglected. The last solution, the worst and most unworthy of the City, would be to call on immigrant labor³⁹. In any case, the City will have to react, can react, and will react! There is nothing there that can dissuade a

³⁹ Resorting to immigrant labor is an unworthy solution in the sense that it presupposes that Citizens of origin would have others do what they themselves would not want to do. Certainly, in the City, immigrant workers would be full-fledged Citizens (Citizenship not being confused with Nationality), but one cannot ignore the underlying thought of Citizens of origin: You can come, provided you are our lackeys, in a way, our slaves! It would be solving one problem by creating new ones.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Citizen conscious of his Dignity from fighting for Equality! Certainly, the City would also have its problems! But what are technical problems, of which the monetary system is not exempt, compared to the problems of Rights that the latter violates by nature?

However, beware, citizen! Now you assert that, in Equality, "arduous" jobs would be deserted by citizens, and in a moment, you will argue that citizens, not being superior in rights regardless of their work in the City, would settle for any job that comes their way! In other words, you are about to declare that citizens would be jostling to occupy the jobs you just said would be deserted! Some might react this way — which still answers your first question — but do you believe that all men are disposed in the same way, that all have the same capacities, and that they can orient themselves toward a sector other than the one that suits them best? Nowadays, Mony seems to be the main motivation. But scratch the surface, and you will find the real motivations in the very nature of individuals⁴⁰! Because when it comes to directing our lives, it is deep, visceral, invincible, often unconscious considerations that inspire us... not Mony! It may exercise a passing attraction and lead us against our will down the wrong path, but without the inner motivation for what we do, abandoning that path is certain sooner or later! We can only find pleasure in what we excel at, and we excel only in what pleases us! True artists are not stopped by poverty! The born leader will always be a leader! The altruist will always go towards others! Etc.

These considerations, however, overlook the fact that citizenship and the accompanying rights are obtained through participation in the life of the city, often through work, whether one enjoys it or not! Those who wish to be citizens, to enjoy the rights of citizenship, must participate in the life of the city and engage in a profession recognized by it. Work is not meant to please the citizen but to primarily satisfy the needs of the city! It's fortunate if citizens manage to align their preferences with their duties, but this is of no concern to the city. The city has no business with how citizens fulfill their duties, except to take action when they fail to do so, just as it does not concern itself with how they exercise their rights, except to sanction them when abused. Citizens are free and must assume their freedom. It is the responsibility of citizens to

40 The nature of an individual does not allow us to predict what they will do, but it certainly allows us to say what they cannot do.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

choose their profession or to engage in a livelihood. It is not enough for an individual to have natural abilities or skills in a particular field; they must also be willing to use them professionally, promote them, and ultimately capture the attention of an enterprise or establish their own. Otherwise, they must serve the city in another way and find a livelihood or even permanent employment in a different field. However, their disappointment is not compounded by oppression; their position does not expose them to exploitation. The city would not commit such injustices; it would not infringe on the rights of those who are already affected in their morals.

At these words, some may be tempted to say that the reign of Equality must also, if possible, be that of individual fulfillment and total freedom. It's beautiful! It's profound! Unfortunately, Equality cannot exist without the city, and the city cannot exist without citizens bound together by duties. It is the duties of citizens that generate the benefits of the city. If no one fulfilled their duties or if everyone did as they pleased, independent of the needs of the city, who would guarantee rights to the citizens? Who would produce? Who can believe that individuals from a capitalist background, ignorant of both their duties and rights, advocates of minimal effort but eager for pleasures, would willingly engage in tasks if not compelled in some way? Let's be serious! Even assuming, by the greatest of miracles, that everyone feels morally obliged to do something, not all functions would be filled, while others would be more than saturated. Therefore, the city cannot allow everyone to define for themselves what participating in the life of the city means. Imagine if everyone set, according to their mood, what they would do in a day, their working hours, etc. Nothing would function. Certainly, we have said that all tastes are in nature. But we assumed that there were positions to be filled and that citizens would have to make choices unless, due to a lack of positions or skills, they had no choice, so that, willingly or unwillingly, all positions would be filled. Here, it is being suggested that, without any constraint, citizens would engage in all activities useful to the city, naturally distribute themselves among all professions, and spontaneously do everything that no one would demand of them. If these were the conditions of equality, it would indeed be impossible to achieve, due to the lack of a viable system.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

In fact, personal fulfillment, like many others, is an individualistic and capitalist pretext to obscure the principles and perpetuate inequality while posing as a humanist and revolutionary. But have we really thought about the consequences of equality, as we present it, from an individual perspective? What would work in the city have in common with work in a capitalist enterprise? The same activity would take place under very different practical and moral conditions. Outside of work, life itself would be relieved of all financial constraints and therefore greatly eased. Then, everyone would be free to pursue their passions and thrive! Instead of being encouraged to let go, citizens would be called upon to surpass themselves, to highlight their differences, to struggle to make their talents and virtues known and recognized! That is the secret of the dynamism of Equality!

Mrs. Shortsighted: Mr. Accuser, you present Work as a Duty. But what would happen, in Equality, to a Citizen who is unemployed?

Citizen, Work is a form of participation in the life of the City, and participating in the life of the City is the primary condition for being a Citizen. If Citizenship confers Rights, it is the fulfillment of Duties that confers Citizenship. For anyone who wants to become or remain a Citizen, working or participating in the life of the City is therefore a Duty, not a Right as you imply.

Furthermore, a Right, depending on its nature (fundamental, indirect, or specific), stems from the exercise of a Right or the fulfillment of a Duty. However, Work stems neither from the exercise of a Right nor from the fulfillment of a Duty. It is therefore not a Right. On the other hand, the act of working generates Rights. It is, by definition, a Duty.

Moreover, a Right is a freedom that Citizens enjoy or can exercise. If Work were a Right, Citizens would be free not to work. Individuals are indeed free not to work, but not Citizens. Citizens can, to some extent, choose (based on their preferences, skills, and available positions) what they want to do for

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Work, but they do not have the choice of whether to work or not. They must work.

Citizen, you did not say that Work should be recognized as a Right, but you are troubled that we present it as a Duty, even though it can evidently be nothing else. Why this disturbance? Because the monetary system generates unemployment and deprives individuals of the only truly legitimate way (in a monetary system) to obtain income. It is in this aberrant situation that the absurd idea of the right to work was born. This idea is, however, no more absurd than all the ideas that people conceive about rights in a state of non-law. Nevertheless, is it not futile to claim work as a right from the very system that generates unemployment and, even when it enshrines this right in texts, is incapable of guaranteeing it? Consequently, would it not be utterly ridiculous, on the part of true Citizens, to continue supporting such an absurd conception of Work in a Society that would finally be worthy of its name, a Society that would no longer know the inconsistencies of the monetary system and would even make them glaringly apparent? Because unemployment is a state against nature and an antisocial phenomenon that only Mony allows to be perceived as logical and justified against all evidence.

There could be no unemployment in Equality. Two explanations for this:

The first, which is a matter of common sense, is that an individual has more needs and desires than they can satisfy through their own efforts. Therefore, several individuals are necessary to meet the needs and desires of one. The City should mobilize all its Citizens to best satisfy, within its capacities, the needs and desires of each of them, without fully achieving it. In other words, there would be more jobs than Citizens to fill them. Citizens would have a multitude of choices to fulfill their Duty to participate in the life of the City. Therefore, it would be impossible for them to be unemployed, except voluntarily, in which case they would no longer be Citizens⁴¹.

The second explanation, which has a macroeconomic dimension but essentially aligns with the first, is that Citizens would enjoy a Right to access

41 We simplify. Voluntary unemployment or even involuntary unemployment could exist. The bankruptcy of a company would still be possible, although for different reasons and under different conditions. Citizens could also need time to transition from one job to another. These situations would be addressed by the law, and the citizenship of individuals in question would not be jeopardized. However, what we call voluntary unemployment here concerns individuals who would not want to work, similar to some who currently take advantage of the monetary system's guilty conscience to mingle with its victims and thus usurp the aid it provides.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

an almost unlimited market. The General Demand would therefore be itself limitless. However, the Supply, the real given, consisting of goods produced and especially services rendered, linked to the quantity of employed workers (and mechanical potential), is by nature limited and would always be so in Equality. It follows that the Supply, pulled upwards by colossal Demand, would increase until it reaches its maximum level, synonymous with full employment, without reaching that of Demand. Instead of Supply and Demand being in an unstable equilibrium, with all the economic consequences, generally negative (called crises), that this implies in the monetary system, the enormous and inevitable gap that would exist between them in Equality would paradoxically ensure unshakable economic stability. Full employment would not only be achieved but would be permanent in the City.

Unemployment, being impossible in Equality, is therefore indeed a phenomenon linked to Mony. Why? Because, unlike in Equality where Citizens could fully enjoy the benefits of the City through a Right to access an essentially unlimited market, creating opportunities and jobs in all areas, under Mony, this "Right" is limited by currency and generally kept at a very low level. As a result, the vast majority of individuals barely satisfy their needs, stifle most of their desires, and do not stimulate the economic machine to produce or hire. Supply, which, in a monetary system, no longer expresses the volume of goods produced and services offered but corresponds to the sum of their prices, can technically reach the level of Demand, must be maintained at its level and is maintained there through price movements. Under these conditions, a decrease in Demand, caused by a decrease in wages or an increase in prices, generates unsold goods and artificial overproduction, forces companies to produce less, causes layoffs, and creates real unemployment. Unemployment, in turn, lowers Demand and destroys other jobs⁴². The economy enters a vicious circle.

To exit or attempt to exit this vicious circle, the State can try to boost Demand by imposing a (meager) increase in wages or by promoting employment, encouraging companies to hire. However, each of these solutions has

⁴² We have not discussed all the parameters (imports, exports, wars, weather events, stock market crashes, etc.) that can influence the Demand or Supply, which not only would not fundamentally question this mechanism but would show how artificial and precarious the monetary system is.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

drawbacks. Increasing wages kills companies and triggers price increases. Furthermore, if this wage increase is done by reducing employer contributions, the State loses a large part of its revenue and must compensate for this loss by putting the "Citizens" to contribution, which reduces or cancels the wage increase. Favoring employment means lowering the gross or net cost of labor for companies⁴³. Lowering the gross cost means, once again, reducing the charges that the State imposes on companies, creating a deficit in the state's coffers, a deficit that the State is then obliged to fill by directly or indirectly imposing the "Citizens," causing the Demand to stagnate or even decrease. Lowering the net cost of labor means allowing companies to pay their (new) employees less than before, which encourages them to hire but does not significantly increase Demand, for the same reasons as before. Another solution is to reduce or eliminate unemployment benefits, which has multiple effects: 1) The State is financially relieved of a huge burden; 2) It is a tragedy for the real victims of the crisis; 3) Profiteers are forced to find employment; 4) The sudden increase in job seekers leads to a decrease in wages.

In the end, none of these solutions, whether applied individually or in combination with others, can guarantee full employment, given the numerous and unexpected perverse effects of the monetary system. They have all been tried in France in recent decades with the known level of success! It is therefore rare for full employment to be achieved⁴⁴. However, a situation of full employment is not a panacea in itself! Because the problem for individuals in a monetary system is less about having a job than about purchasing power. What does it matter to them to work if they earn nothing, if they are exploited, if the prevailing prosperity is just a spectacle for them? The fact that all individuals work, that an optimum balance between Supply and Demand is achieved (in terms of prices), does not mean that wages are comfortable or that the entire productive potential of the "Society" is unleashed. On the

⁴³ We refer to the gross cost of labor as the cost that an employee represents for a company, including the gross salary paid to that employee (since the employee actually receives a net salary, with the difference between the gross and net salary going to the state as taxes or contributions), and the employer's contributions paid to the state. We refer to the net cost of labor for a company as the gross salary of the employee.

⁴⁴ The post-World War II prosperity period led us to believe that unemployment is abnormal and indicative of a crisis. However, it's the opposite. Full employment is an exceptional situation in a monetary system. Unemployment is not a new phenomenon. Every page of history bears witness to it. The difficulty in resolving it today is additional evidence of this.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

contrary! Full employment in a capitalist system often implies poor working conditions⁴⁵ and always assumes that a large number of personnel is busy generating currency, in other words, creating nothing of substance. The Supply (of goods but especially services) is therefore well below the maximum productive potential of "Society." Yet, it is this reduced collective product that "Citizens" share, moreover, unevenly. The average share per "Citizen" is already mediocre in theory; the share of the "Citizens" at the bottom, i.e., the vast majority of individuals, is therefore relatively miserable in reality⁴⁶.

Full employment in a monetary system is therefore not only a rare and precarious situation but also unsatisfactory for individuals from a material or moral standpoint. Even if individuals were to settle for it, it would still be contemptible from the perspective of Principles! Is it not then disheartening to know that all governments make or claim to make the return to full employment their top priority and exhaust themselves in a futile struggle or for insignificant victories? Is there really anything to celebrate when unemployment has decreased by 0.1% in a given month and when "Citizens" have found uncertain employment paid peanuts? The sterile fight against unemployment is nonetheless legitimate, but what is more legitimate and fruitful than Equality among Citizens?

Mr Glutton: But why would Citizens work more if, being equal, they had nothing more to gain from it?

What are you trying to achieve, citizen? To defend Mony or to denigrate Equality? In either case, the goal is missed. To answer you, we first need to clarify your question and understand all the intentional or unintentional

⁴⁵ Make no mistake. Under money, the wealth of some is always based, in one way or another, on the exploitation of others, and it's not because the exploited are not seen that they do not exist. When the "Citizens" of a country are not exploited or at least miserable, when this country seems overall rich, it's because poverty has been exported, and poorly paid jobs have been outsourced.

⁴⁶ In France, approximately 70% of the population shares about 30% of the income, including the 20% of the population that only shares 6%.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

implications. You wonder why Citizens would work more if it no longer brought them anything, in other words, if an excess of work was no longer rewarded with additional salary, rights, or goods. You therefore assume that Citizens would work less in Equality than under Mony since it would be impossible to incentivize them with the prospect of gain. You imply that Mony alone motivates people. At the same time, you suggest that today individuals work more than the law requires to earn more than the legal wage, and that this is a good thing. But a good thing for whom? For individuals to whom the law grants insufficient wages and rights, and who sacrifice their personal lives to compensate? For a system that mocks them? Or for a Society that does not exist? And is it even true that today people work more than is required of them, and that those who work more earn more? No! Employees are compelled by law to work a certain amount of time, and few have the opportunity or desire to work more, as it is often not worth the effort. As for those without a defined working time, such as executives, their salary remains fixed regardless of their efforts. We could also discuss the legions of people who, by nature or because they are poorly paid, do the minimum required.

You see, citizen, that the assumption on which your question is based, namely that individuals in a monetary system work more to earn more and do indeed earn more, is false, if not questionable. Your assertion that, in Equality, Citizens would not work more than required of them is at least adventurous, if not inconsistent! Because, fundamentally, what do you know about what Work would be like in the City? Once again, you isolate a problem from its context that you do not know and consider it based on the parameters of the context you know or think you know. You neglect the fact that Equality would influence everything and have its own mechanisms.

Firstly, you forget that working would no longer be primarily an obligation for oneself but a Duty to the City. In fact, Work would be part of the broader Duty for a Citizen to participate in the life of the City. This participation would be defined by the City. Applied to Work, this means that workers or businesses would have a task to fulfill and minimum results (monthly or annually) to achieve, results expressed in terms of sales or clients⁴⁷. (Note that, contrary

⁴⁷ Minimum results expressed in terms of sales or customers would, in a context where Citizens are free and have an equal Right of access to the market, be an indicator of the quality of products and services. On the contrary, results

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

to what one might think, these minimum results would be high, as they would be established to prove to the City that individuals are indeed working and deserving of Citizenship.) It would not be a priori necessary to work more to be recognized as a Citizen, but it would be imperative to meet these requirements. The goal being imposed on Citizens, they would be free to choose the means to achieve it, and one of these means would obviously be time. Therefore, there would be no predetermined working hours. Consequently, working more, in the sense of working more than the legal number of hours, would mean nothing for Citizens.

We have just mentioned that workers would have minimum results to achieve to be recognized as Citizens, meaning to obtain or retain Citizenship. However, this is purely theoretical. Stripping an individual of Citizenship, and thus all their Rights, would be far too severe a punishment to be ordinary. In practice, negative results would only expose individuals to light but deterrent sanctions. These sanctions would, of course, be of a novel nature but would not infringe upon the Rights of Citizens, as nothing could annul Equality. Without delving into the question of sanctions, which is not our concern here, these explanations are sufficient to glimpse the meaning that the expression "working more" would take in the City. It would indeed mean working more not in comparison to others, not in relation to the law, but in relation to the time or efforts initially planned by the individuals to achieve their minimum and obligatory results⁴⁸. It would no longer be about working more to gain something but to lose nothing, or more precisely, not to be sanctioned... which would constitute a motivation at least as powerful, if not more so, than the first.

expressed in terms of production would not encourage the production of quality and would lead companies to indulge in mediocrity. It is also logical that results are expressed in terms of sales or customers since Labor confers Citizenship and the Right of access to the market, in other words, the Right, for a Citizen, to enjoy the goods and services produced or offered by their Fellow Citizens. The enjoyment of this Right is justified only if a Citizen also provides their Fellow Citizens with the opportunity to exercise theirs, meaning that as a worker, they bring goods or services to the market that others desire, just as they benefit from the Labor of others. Producing for no one or producing nothing is the same thing from the perspective of Citizens, from the perspective of the City. Why would the City grant a Right to an individual who generates none for their Fellow Citizens?

48 These results would not be established for each company in relation to a general economic plan but in relation to each company, the nature of its activity, the number of its employees, and its location. They would not be established by a central national body but by a local institution. The purpose of these results would not be to achieve the economic balance of the City but only to compel companies to do what their potential would oblige them to do. It would not be the City, as a representation of all Citizens, that would determine the economic balance, but the City, as a set of consumers, that is, the market, which would encourage companies to go beyond to satisfy Demand as much as possible, and thus naturally achieve a balance impossible to predict.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

It is also important to keep in mind that Citizens would have access to the market through a means of exchange, and businesses would thus be in competition. As we mentioned, both independent workers and businesses would have minimum results to achieve under the threat of sanctions. But how to achieve these results and avoid sanctions with certainty if not by imposing superior results compared to those required, by always satisfying the clientele to retain and gain new clients (thus forcing other businesses to adopt the same attitude), in other words, by no longer considering the minimum results defined by the City? The expression "working more" would then take on a second meaning, namely working more than required by the City, this surplus being obtained either through additional working hours (compared to the time necessary to meet the minimum results) or through an improvement in work organization. In fact, it would still be about working more not to be sanctioned, but this consideration would soon be overshadowed by the habit of working to satisfy fellow Citizens and the awareness of the Duty to work.

You believe, citizen, that only individuals earning nothing can be motivated to work extra hours. You deduce that Citizens, earning everything, would not be inclined to work more. But you overlook the working conditions that Equality would create, which would bear no resemblance to current conditions. The employees of a company would be collectively responsible for its results in the eyes of the City⁴⁹. They would be united with the company, a company that respects and listens to them. They would have as many reasons to invest in their Work as they currently have to do as little as possible. Why would employees go the extra mile for a company that exploits and disrespects them? Conversely, what could employees refuse to a company and colleagues with whom they share destinies? It could be argued that an overly solicited employee would change companies. However, just as today an employee is exploited regardless of the company they work for, all companies in the City, driven by the market, would solicit their employees! In fact, equal Citizens with nothing to gain in terms of Rights would generally work better

⁴⁹ Independent workers would have results to achieve and would be personally monitored by the City. But the personal work of Citizens grouped in a company would be uncontrollable by the City. The City could only control the results of the company as a whole, with each employee being a representative.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

and more than exploited individuals who inevitably tend to cut corners or refuse work instead of rushing to meet it.

Yet, even if Citizens were to do only the minimum required, why would that be a problem? As we demonstrated earlier, there would be no unemployment in Equality. All Citizens would work. Moreover, all would produce goods or provide services useful to their fellow Citizens. Without extraordinary effort, the generated wealth would already surpass that of a monetary system. Therefore, why fear that Citizens would not work more when, to produce as much as a monetary system, they could individually work less? Why defend Mony and preserve the monetary system under the pretext that individuals sometimes work more than the average to collect a few crumbs, while these same individuals, becoming Citizens, would reap much more without doing more?

That being said, we have so far only discussed the most common case, that of employees and Citizens working solely out of Duty. However, there would also be Citizens who enjoy working or love their Work: artisans, artists, etc. By definition, these individuals would always work for pleasure, and Equality, far from being a drawback, would eliminate many obstacles that Mony places in their way. They would not work more than today, but they would always work more than their fellow Citizens, and in much better conditions.

There remains a particular case to examine: that of creators or business leaders. Your question, citizen, indeed compels us to wonder why Citizens would complicate their lives by creating a business when they would have nothing to gain from it a priori. But this would be to believe, once again, that starting a business in the City would occur under the same conditions as under Mony. However, without saying that it would become simple, it would certainly be less complicated. It would still require work, but it would not pose any risks to those involved—financial risks that today serve to justify the wealth of business owners. Business leaders would still be leaders, but they would no longer be solely responsible since, for the City, the company would no longer be embodied by them alone but by all employees, including themselves. In the end, individuals obligated, as Citizens, to work, unable to materially gain anything more than their fellow Citizens but enjoying leadership and having a project, would have nothing to lose by trying to

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

realize it and much to gain personally. The reward for their efforts would no longer be wealth and flattery but inner satisfaction and the recognition or respect of their fellow Citizens.

The need for recognition... that is one of the primary drivers of humanity! That is the motive that, even today, compels individuals to break away from the beaten path, to surpass themselves to evoke admiration. But Mony hides this truth from us. It sometimes adds luster to success but compromises the satisfaction of the need for recognition it is supposed to fulfill. By making wealth the measure of merit, Mony generates frustration among those whose merit is not validated by wealth and who are then underestimated by others, as well as among the wealthy whose merit, when they have it, shines less than their fortune. Consequently, the latter are unable to know whether others see in them their wealth or their merit, whether they are respected or feared, whether their qualities are acknowledged or favors are expected, whether they are friends or hangers-on. As a result, they do not know what they truly inspire in others, and their need for recognition is never satisfied. It is also because they anticipate and fear these ambiguities that some unconsciously refuse to embark on paths that lead to wealth⁵⁰.

Equality, on the other hand, would eliminate these uncertainties and extraneous considerations currently attached to success. Both groups could freely pursue their ambitions without fear. Unable to exploit anyone or be victims of exploitation, unable to be admired for anything other than themselves or be scorned for trivialities, materially satisfied Citizens would only need to elevate themselves morally to fulfill their need for recognition. The energy thus liberated, invested in Work or any other activity, would, moreover, be of considerable benefit to the City.

50 In his study of Democracy in America, Tocqueville makes the following observation about elected officials and other officials: "In democracy, ordinary citizens see a man who emerges from their ranks and who, in a few years, attains wealth and power; this spectacle arouses their surprise and envy; they seek to understand how someone who was their equal yesterday is now endowed with the right to lead them. Attributing his rise to his talents or virtues is inconvenient because it means admitting that they themselves are less virtuous and less skillful than he. They therefore attribute the main cause of his elevation to some of his vices, and often they are right to do so." (1835, GF-Flammarion, 1981, Volume I, p. 313) The same can be said verbatim about the rich, the bosses, etc.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mr Neuron : All of this is very nice, Mr. Accuser, but you make assertions without presenting any figures, without relying on a precise study, without providing economic or historical analysis... From the beginning, everything you say is just suppositions! Why, under these conditions, continue to listen to you?

Do you believe, citizen, that figures would add to our understanding and that a detailed historical study would undermine what common sense deduces and what the eyes observe? Barter and hence money responded to an economic need, and it is not necessary to know history in detail to understand which one! Moreover, even history is approximate or silent when it comes to going back into the mists of time! We say that barter has no reason to exist in primitive societies, that it appears when individuals, endowed with a rare talent, begin to manufacture specific objects that they cannot share and are led to barter. Only common sense allows us to say that things unfolded in this way. On what else could we base ourselves to understand the origin of barter and Mony? What kind of study could confirm or contradict it? Even assuming that we could know who made the first barter, when it happened, and what were the first objects exchanged, what more would we know?

So, we say that men practiced barter out of necessity, that with it was born the notion of market value that we call here Mony; that the practice of direct exchange in theory led to the use of various reference objects, in other words, the use of means of exchange, allowing indirect exchange; that money, in the modern sense of the term, was both an evolution and a standardization of means of exchange, but not an invention⁵¹; and that money, being a standard of value, is directly based on Mony. But what would we learn from knowing, for example, that money existed in China 10,000 years BC, in the form of shells (cowries), then, in the 6th century BC, in the form of bronze cowries; that, in the 3rd millennium BC, the Egyptians used rings or small pieces of gold or silver; that struck money appeared in Lydia in the 6th century BC and was successively adopted by the Persians, Greeks, Barbarians, and even the Gauls? That would teach us nothing! Delving in this direction would only capture our attention in vain... and this time wasted for us would be one more

⁵¹ Money was not invented from scratch, as it took over not only the principles of exchange methods in use under barter but also their support. Metal coins, for example, simply replaced reference objects made of the same metal. However, one can still speak of invention, but only concerning their form, which is of little importance.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

victory for Mony, whose illusions we would once again have pursued! The important thing, in money, is not to know the varied forms that men have given it throughout the ages, but to understand what it represents (Mony) and what it naturally entails as consequences. Here, common sense prevails over culture, and Principles over figures!

But, according to you, everything we say is just pure speculation, baseless claims! Why not be more direct, citizen, and declare that we're talking nonsense? Why not argue that the monetary system does not rely on the notion of value, on Mony; that money, which is used for purchasing, does not embody the right of access to the market; that monetary units can be evenly distributed among "Citizens"; that the rich and the poor are equal in rights and before the law; that workers are not exploited, oppressed; that Mony does not divide people, and they do not damn themselves for it, in short, that the monetary system is wonderful, and capitalist "Society" is the masterpiece of social order? But, faced with hordes of destitute people, faced with all the problems caused by Mony, how could you support such statements without blushing?

Citizen, you want to see when understanding is enough, and you want to reason when looking is sufficient. You want things to be complicated so that they are too complicated for you, and under this pretext, you can turn away from them without shame! You want numbers, the numbers of what? Unemployment, homelessness, inflation, GDP, CAC 40, individual incomes, crimes, the amount of fraud, etc.? To know everything about these constantly changing and manipulated figures, which, moreover, do not teach anything essential on the subject, you would have to be constantly on the lookout! When then would you take the time to form your opinion on Mony if that were your condition for having one? Do you count the falling drops to know that it is raining, or do dark clouds inform you sufficiently that it is going to rain? There are signs that do not deceive!

Economists, experts in all these figures you demand, proudly display their impotence against the laws of Mony and content themselves with adapting our world to them as faithfully as possible. They have nothing to say, but they say it well! They claim to care about Man, but how could they serve two masters at the same time when the first is inflexible and the second is on its

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

knees? If they are incapable of solving problems despite their skills, how could the common people doubt their authority and conclusions? Yet their reasoning is as logical as it is devoid of common sense! And, as a fatal consequence, their theories are as unquestioned as common sense is banned! A people who rely on statistics, economic indicators, and experts to know if the weather is good without opening their window is a people condemned to face all storms! To know what we are bogged down in, is there really a need for a third person adorned with diplomas brandishing charts?

As for whether what we say about Equality is utopian or logical, only you can judge. But again, what kind of scientific or historical study could we present to convince you that it is the fundamental Principle of social order⁵² and that its reign would be as harmonious as that of Mony is calamitous? Where would we find the numbers to support our statements about a world that we can only imagine when these numbers are difficult or impossible to establish for the world we have before our eyes? Nevertheless, it is not a matter of blind faith. We assert nothing; we demonstrate everything. So, you don't have numbers to sink your teeth into, but you can always consider our reasoning, acknowledge its coherence, find its flaws, or even condemn it... Why not, if your reasons are well-founded, and your arguments, solid! But what can really be opposed to the Principles of Equality other than monetary or capitalist prejudices? What can be opposed to an irrefutable demonstration, except perfidious subterfuges? So, what have you done by claiming that only an economic or historical analysis could authorize us to attack Mony and justify that you listen to us? You have declared that you did not want to hear anything that disturbs your prejudices and troubles your faith in Mony.

52 Thus, Jacques Goldberg, in *Les Sociétés animales* (Ed. delachaux et Niestlé, 2003), studies the habits of social animals and the sociability of animals but never defines what a Society is, what its Principles are, and what the Duties and Rights of Citizens are. Obsessed with details, he fails to see the generalities. (Nevertheless, let's say that, even if he fails to establish the Principles of Society, he knows when, despite misleading appearances, animals live in Society or not.) Worse! He hopes to find in the specific behavior of individuals of each species, in other words, in what distinguishes species, what characterizes the social phenomenon, in other words, the Principles of Society, identical, according to us, regardless of the species. It is evident that this endless method—new observations or experiments always being possible—cannot lead to such a result since, fundamentally, its purpose is not to achieve it. And he concludes: "[...] a simple aggregation of individuals does not constitute a social fact. For there to be truly a social phenomenon, each individual must exert an action on the group and vice versa. This reciprocal stimulation is specific to each species; the individual is attracted by the signals sent by its peers. These exchanges of signals – no longer just attraction – will constitute the phenomenon of communication. Every society is a system of communication and vice versa. [...] Many current research efforts also tend to focus on the comparison of social species with each other. In-depth work on the structures of social groups at the same time as an exploration of the means of communication will shed light on many questions that have remained unanswered." (p. 292, 293)

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

En summary, this trial is unnecessary. Only the fact that too many people react as you just did makes it necessary. Citizens must be equal in Duties and Rights. They are not because Mony is incompatible with Equality. This is fundamentally what a "Citizen," aware of being affected in their Dignity, must know today to adopt a firm stance against Mony! If you want to show intelligence, then pose the social equation and seek how to achieve Equality! Apart from that, everything you take for insight is just pusillanimity, and you alone are fooled!

But, citizen, since you want us to be down-to-earth, let's talk about you, about you and Mony, about you as an individual and Mony as innocent! So, do you claim that, because you are not overwhelmed here with figures and details, our attack against Mony is baseless and defamatory? Don't you look at prices before buying anything, and don't you think twice before making significant expenses? Will you deny that financial reasons sometimes force you to undertake painful and uncertain steps; that you occasionally try to obtain financial assistance; that receiving bills and tax notices makes you furious; that you occasionally save money in anticipation of hard times; that solicitations for humanitarian or other causes make you uncomfortable, not knowing if you should give or not, when you still can; that you don't like being approached on the street, knowing all too well what, in most cases, will be asked of you; that you fear less for your belongings than for the amounts you will have to pay in case of theft or accident; that illness hits you even harder because it exposes you to ruin; that the constant need to pay exasperates you; that you are always on guard to thwart the scammers around us; that you have been attacked and robbed or fear being so; that you demand a salary increase at the first opportunity; that you curb your desires not to exceed the limits of your purchasing power; that the waste of public funds scandalizes you; that the spectacle of opulence and injustice revolts you; that Mony repairs nothing, and your indignation is even stronger when any reparation consists of compensation; that you worry about your financial future; that you spend your time balancing your budget; etc.; in short, that you check your bank account before doing anything and that any event beyond your control weighs on you all the more because it struggles to bear it; in other words, will you dare to claim that the famous financial constraints, which, in practice, translate the tyranny of Mony, do not concern you?

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

From breakfast, where you tell yourself that you got up at dawn to go earn a pittance, to the evening where you close your eyes to stop thinking about the hassles and frustrations, Mony weighs on all your actions, all your thoughts, all your reflexes! Whether you consider the system too powerful to justify your submission to Mony, whether you contest this system without denouncing Mony, which is its heart, or whether you give up everything to escape the grip of Mony, it comes to the same thing: you think as an individual, not as a Citizen; you seek happiness, not JUSTICE! You bend so as not to be morally broken, you accept its weight to find it less heavy! Adored, despised, or fought against, as long as Mony reigns, no one can escape it! In a monetary system, the one who does not chase after Mony is caught up by it! You can struggle, citizen, you can call on scholars and rhetoricians to your rescue, but nothing can change this Truth: people are under the yoke of Mony.

If you persist in denying, would you then be the only person spared by Mony? It is easy to imagine what you would base this denial on: the fact that you would not recognize all the worries listed as your own! But this list was not exhaustive, and admitting to some points would already confirm the general principle! It could also be that you are rich, richer than the typical situation we have described. But the fact that the rich do not have all these worries proves that Mony is a burden from which they are relieved! Yet, even for them, their concerns are of a different nature!

Rich and poor alike are subject to Mony, but under different conditions: the former must retain its favors, the latter must earn them. Each class has its trials, and the trials are proportional to the category! Except for a few extremely wealthy individuals, even the rich count! With an extraordinary lifestyle come extraordinary expenses! Their margins are wider, but they also have limits not to exceed. They do not have to earn Mony—or earn it more easily—they have to manage it! They hide it abroad, invest it in the stock market, make investments, etc. This may seem easy, but they are like everyone else, targets for scams, and unless they manage their fortune themselves—which does not protect them from their own errors in judgment—they have to trust advisors and worry about it. They have many fair-weather friends and no one to trust! They can lose big, and it happens that some rich people lose everything! In those moments, the rich, after having been the

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

docile and pretentious instruments of Mony, appear for what they are: its toys! They owe everything to it! It elevates them; it can crush them! Their lives seem sweeter, but Mony is just as much their master!

Being prime targets, the rich surround themselves with security, for themselves, their family, and their possessions. They recruit guards and retreat to villas or neighborhoods. Now, if they manage to protect themselves from thieves and kidnappers, they are, like everyone else, stripped by the state. (It's justice, but that's not the question.) When their fortune is tied to a business, which is generally the case, they bear its weight alone (which, moreover, allows them to justify their wealth to themselves and to most people). But above all, being rich means not having the right to be unhappy, or at least not to appear so. How could they complain in the midst of the poor? Since it is indecent, misfortune doubly overwhelms them, destroys them morally, and sometimes leads them to destroy themselves physically (especially their children). In the end, the rich are as much victims of Mony as the poor! Its weight is just as heavy, with the only difference being that they bear it as a burden, while the others drag it like a ball and chain!

Mr. Blind: Mr. Accuser, you mentioned that in Equality, the Right of access to the market would not be artificially limited, in other words, it would be limitless! In essence, Equality would make all Citizens wealthy! Doesn't this pose the risk of making them complacent or even suicidal?

Is this, citizen, a subtle way of coming to the aid of Mony? By spreading the idea that Equality would be disastrous, do you hope that the "Citizens" will detest it and bless Mony that preserves them from it? But, whatever your ulterior motive, citizen, it's a good thing that you've raised this question.

Let's clarify first that the Right of access to the market would be unlimited only in theory. In reality, its exercise would encounter various types of limits. Indeed, assuming that this Right is truly unlimited, that the purchasing power

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

of Citizens is infinite, their desires would not be. Even if numerous, desires would be limited. Furthermore, the exercise of the Right of access would be, like any other (indirect) Right, limited by respect for the Rights of others and by the exercise of this same Right by other Citizens. Thus, even if the Right of access were unlimited, a Citizen could not, on their own, appropriate all production and enjoy all services because other Citizens would also exercise their Right, so the common product would necessarily be shared among all Citizens. Theoretically, the share of the common product taken from the market by each Citizen could be equal since all Citizens would have and exercise the same force. But this would overlook, on the one hand, the actual desires of individuals, as not everyone desires the same things or in the same quantities, and on the other hand, the scarcity of products, as all products are scarce at some point or another.

The Right of access would also be exercised, as it is today, based on the first come, first served principle. The means of exchange in the City would allow access to the market, granting the same Right to all Citizens, but the products would become the exclusive properties of the first consumers to have asserted their Right over them. Thus, all Citizens would have the same chances at the start (unlike today), and different properties at the end. Finally, the Right of access to certain products could be limited by law. These legal limits for specific products would have nothing to do with the limits imposed by Money. They would limit, in a targeted and equal manner for all Citizens, the exercise of the Right of access, while Money limits, and in an unequal manner, the right of access (to the market) itself⁵³.

Some may find the first-come, first-served principle contrary to Equality, but only individuals aspiring to equality in possessions can see it as a contradiction. As we have already stated, Equality in Rights is not Equality in possessions. Moreover, this equality, which can only be conceivable, although impractical, within a system of distribution by the State, would render the existence of a means of exchange unnecessary, which we have,

⁵³ In other words, unlike legal limits that, in the general interest, would set the quantity of certain products that Citizens could acquire during a period, their right of access being equal and theoretically unlimited for all other products, Money establishes no distinction between products and theoretically allows access to everything. However, the purchasing power conferred by money, unequal among individuals, simply limits the right of access to the market, forcing choices between products and making some products unattainable.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

on the contrary, admitted as necessary. It follows that Equality must use a means of exchange and, therefore, adopt the first-come, first-served principle. The very nature of a means of exchange is to allow Citizens to access the market and obtain what they want, to the extent possible. This possibility depends, for example, on the products on the shelves in stores. Why should the first arriving Citizen not be the first served or the first to be able to help themselves, regardless of the number of products on the shelf? Should they wait for a second Citizen to arrive? And why only a second? Why not demand that all Citizens show up to finally determine who, in the name of a common Right, can take away the can of sardines or the lawnmower? And what if the first arriving Citizen is the only one interested in the product in question? Why wait for the arrival of Citizens who may never show up? It would not be fair to satisfy the *n*th Citizen to assert their Right, and it is infinitely simpler and more logical that the first to arrive is the first to be granted.

This principle, in appearance, is also followed by the monetary system, except that it is not enough to arrive first (you also need to have Mony), and some products are forever inaccessible to many.

To address your question more precisely, citizen, let's recall that the role of the City or the purpose of Equality is not to make men happy but to guarantee the Rights of Citizens. Access to the market is one of their Rights, and the Principles of the social order require that it be conferred by Citizenship and not artificially limited. It is not to oppose Mony or react to capitalism that we argue that the Right of access of Citizens to the market must be theoretically unlimited, but because it is an irrefutable consequence of Equality.

However, it is evident that the transition from inequality to Equality, from a generally ridiculous purchasing power to a universally high purchasing power, would constitute a revolution and bring about changes in mentalities. But to insinuate that a positive social change would make individuals unhappy, suggesting that they prefer to continue to be exploited and oppressed, is a paradox that only a sophist can support! How can one believe that "Citizens" who demand their Rights vehemently (in the form of salary increases) would be more burdened by enjoying them than by being deprived of them? Do you know many rich people who complain about being rich and poor people who do not dream of becoming rich—even just to no longer be continually

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

hindered and persecuted by Mony or in its name? Especially since the situation of Citizens in Equality would be in no way comparable to that of the rich in inequality! Everyone would indeed have the means to access all the wealth of the City, but they would not be rich in the sense that we understand it! Their comfort would not be based on the misery and exploitation of their fellow Citizens. Their freedoms would be as extensive as possible, but none would have more Rights than others. They would not have a particular social status to display and defend. They would not be surrounded by the envious. Having not experienced frustration, they would not consider their situation advantageous and urgently needing to take advantage of it. Moreover, this comfort would not be imposed on them. Those who would be content with little would not be seen as poor, and those who would surround themselves with much would not arouse anyone's jealousy. The Citizens would have almost the powers of wealth without having the vanity of the rich.

In fact, citizen, by posing this question, you projected a contemporary concern—the desire to possess—into Equality, in a context where it would be meaningless. Thus, by suggesting that Citizens would become jaded, you implied a focus on consumption, on acquiring goods. And then what? Indeed, initially, Citizens would catch up on years of deprivation until they became jaded. But quickly, seeing their basic desires fulfilled and being assured of satisfying their future desires, material concerns would no longer torment them, and they would redirect their attention to another objective, towards the satisfaction of higher needs⁵⁴. Do you believe that humans would have nothing left to think about if their comfort and security were no longer a concern? Do you think they could run out of ideas, dreams, and ambition?

54 According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs, individuals cannot devote themselves to satisfying a higher-level need until their lower-level needs are fulfilled. (We would rather say that an individual can only devote themselves to satisfying a higher-level need when they feel that the lower-level needs are fulfilled, or when they do not feel them strongly, making it easy for even small things to fulfill them.) According to Maslow, there are five classes of needs: 1) physiological needs (eating, clothing, housing, etc.), 2) the need for physical and moral security (job security, income security, etc.), 3) social needs (love, belonging), 4) the need for esteem (consideration, recognition, glory, etc.), 5) the need for self-actualization. In theory, Money, for those it favors, allows the satisfaction of basic needs and therefore the dedication to satisfying higher-level needs. However, in practice, the satisfaction of different needs partly or entirely depends on Money, which poses a constant threat to the satisfaction of basic needs and compromises the satisfaction of higher-level needs. People are either overwhelmed by poverty or burdened by wealth. Thus, Money makes them either hungry or gluttonous, in any case, beings confined to basic concerns. This is the key difference with Equality, which, by satisfying basic needs, would not only allow Citizens to devote themselves to satisfying higher-level needs but also truly fulfill them. Citizens would thus have different concerns than those of present-day individuals, hence the difficulty for the latter to free themselves from Money and to contemplate without fear a world without it, without the needs, habits, and deficiencies it generates—a world in which they could finally dedicate themselves to satisfying needs they do not experience or cannot conceive of how they could be fulfilled.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Isn't it rather distressing to see humans today essentially obsessed with possessions? The desire to have is nothing more than an imposed and superimposed element by Mony on the need to be! Liberated from this petty and malevolent desire, humans could finally devote themselves to themselves, to their reason for being, to their becoming!

Finally, citizen, you have exaggerated a problem known to the rich and not ignored by the poor, so you pity the rich and overlook the poor! It is a classic reflex of the obscure to pity the notable. It is far from true that all the rich commit suicide and that all the poor are happy! However, by looking closely, the cause of despair in both is often the same. As ridiculous as it is to note that Mony does not bring happiness, given that it is not its role, it would be useful to realize that it brings unhappiness, both public and private! Besides, by nature, it is difficult for humans to give meaning or find the meaning of their lives; Mony adds the nonsense of "Society" to their fragile shoulders! However, when nothing makes sense anymore, senseless acts become logical! Certainly, Equality would not provide ready-made answers that individuals hope for and that they alone must find. However, it would at least relieve Citizens of the torments that a Society should not make them endure. It would not bring back lost loves; it would not resurrect the dead, etc., but it would dispel the specter of poverty, bankruptcy, and so many other calamities whose dramatic impact on private life is well known. In short, by providing Citizens with everything it owes them, the City would provide humans with everything it can!

Citizen, this reflex question has revealed how deeply you are influenced by the monetary context. Let's take advantage of the opportunity to discuss the influence of the context on the mentality and behavior of humans.

This influence is a priori undeniable. An individual does not build themselves from nothing but from everything around them. It is impossible to predict in advance how a given context will influence an individual because each individual has a unique component that makes them react in their own way. Nevertheless, every individual is deeply marked by their context. The important thing is not to know how individuals react individually in a particular context but to understand that their attitude, whatever it may be, is a reaction to this context, that they are all, in short, products of this context.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

The reaction of individuals to a given context is the result of the combination of their character, the personality they have forged, and the possibilities that the context allows them. We distinguish character, i.e., the deep nature of individuals (gentle, tough, credulous, orderly, etc.), from personality because the latter is already strongly influenced by the context. From a general perspective, individuals' lives, way of thinking, and worldview are shaped by the language, culture, history, and current events of the country in which they were born, grew up, and live. For example, a young Palestinian and a young Israeli are separated by a world before even being born. From a particular perspective, each individual's life, way of thinking, and worldview are influenced by parents or family, personal experiences, etc., which, in turn, have not escaped the influence of the general context. Then, as we mentioned, individuals' reactions depend on the action possibilities the context allows them. In other words, individuals can make choices, and they do so based on their character, but there are choices they cannot make or even conceive since they do not exist as possibilities. Thus, when people believed the earth was flat and bordered by a precipice in the distance, it did not occur to anyone to set sail.

The context conditions the mentality and behavior of individuals: this is an absolute truth. It was true yesterday, it is true today, it will still be true tomorrow. Today, as yesterday, we live in a monetary system, in a context where Money is king. It would be child's play to demonstrate that Money, more than anything else, influences the course of our "Societies" and thus influences their history, culture, current events, and therefore the concerns, ideas, and actions of individuals. Is not the first consequence of Money to impose inequality, to divide people into poor and rich? Can a poor person and a rich person perceive the world with the same eyes? Is not the very act of rebelling against inequality a consequence of inequality, thus an attitude provoked by Money? Another consequence of Money for humans is the constant need for currency. Does this need not lead them to all sorts of madness, to the most odious trafficking, to the most criminal projects, to the most unworthy attitudes of Man? And what are the reactions (physical or moral) to all these behaviors if not indirect consequences of Money? Whatever the attitude of humans, it is therefore Money that allows or imposes it on them.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

But is not the supreme consequence of Mony to make Equality inconceivable? As soon as people hear about it, they all formulate the same objections and ask the same questions. They have not all attended capitalist schools. Useless! The monetary system is the school of capitalism! In fact, whether they like it or not, whether they are aware of it or not, humans, in a monetary system, reason in relation to Mony and think through it! Certainly, this is what is most unbearable for them, what disturbs their self-esteem the most, they who believe they are original and want to be absolutely free but who are inevitably subject to their context and today to Mony. This is one of the great truths that this trial will highlight, and one of the main reasons why many, to spare their pride, will plug their ears.

Therefore, note that the context, whatever it may be, influences people. This is undeniable for a context dominated by Mony... and there is no reason why this would not be the case for Equality. But it is obvious that Equality, which would be a revolution unprecedented in history, would influence people differently than Mony. How, indeed, could equal Citizens perceive others and the world in general in the same way as unequal individuals? How to believe that Citizens peacefully enjoying their Rights would continue to maintain among themselves the relationships that individuals condemned to conquer their rights over their neighbors and defend them against them have? By radically changing the basis of social relations, Equality would change everything related to Society, starting with the force of circumstances. Since almost everything is marked in one way or another by the social environment, almost everything would undergo a radical transformation.

Now, it is not a matter of saying that the City would be a perfect world, which in itself means nothing. No! It would also have problems, but these problems would be new, just as the possible solutions would be. It is not a matter of saying that men would be unrecognizable, but surely, they would no longer project the same image as today. For how could they still do or want what is doable or conceivable only in a monetary system? And how could they be the same when they no longer want the same things and do different things? Even identical actions would no longer have the same consequences for them and for others and could not therefore be committed with the same intentions or in the same interest!

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mr Neuron: But, Mr. Accuser, for the context of Man to change, for Equality to come about, Man must first change himself!

Citizen, we do not accuse Mony because of what Man is but in the name of Equality. We advocate Equality not for Man to change but for Citizens to finally enjoy all their Rights. However, we anticipate that Man could not be under Equality what he is under Mony since, always being the product of his context, he would be shaped differently. This change would, therefore, be the effect of a new context, not the cause of the novelty of the context. But you, citizen, think that men must change before the context and would like this change to be considered a priority.

But why, citizen, want Man to change? So that he is no longer the vile being we know, that is, the being shaped by the monetary system? Is it not in itself recognizing that Man is the product of his context and that he cannot change as long as he is immersed in this same context? Therefore, wanting Man to change before his context is not desiring the impossible? You can claim, citizen, that men can suddenly be immaculate while still wallowing in the mud, but we argue that, for them to finally be clean, we must first change the water in which they bathe. Men cannot think and act in a context as if this context did not exist and even less as if they were already evolving in another!

Your remark, citizen, is based on confusion. You confuse the context and the men. Men being for you the context, it would be enough for men to change for the context to change in fact. However, men surrounding an individual certainly participate in his context, but they are not the context itself. The context is beyond men; it is the framework in which they all evolve. Men are to the context what players are to a game.

So imagine, citizens, that men play Monopoly. Each plays in his own way but all follow the rules of the game. Each, being able to adopt a way of playing, can also change it. But changing the way of playing does not change the

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

nature of the game itself! A player can at best stop playing; he cannot, on the pretext of disgust for Monopoly, start playing by the rules of another game. The situation is different if all players decide to play another game, in which case nothing prevents them. Well! The monetary system is a life-size Monopoly. Men are forced to follow its rules and follow them even when they believe they are escaping, since it is impossible for them to individually leave the game. In other words, whatever they change in themselves, whatever attitude they adopt in the face of the monetary system, they do not shake it in any way, they do not worry about Money, which continues to exert its influence. Even if some men could detach themselves from the monetary system to the point of no longer suffering its influences (which is only a figment of the imagination), the mass remains conditioned by the system and perpetuates it.

Men cannot change while remaining in the same context, and they would not change their context even by changing personally⁵⁵. In fact, there is only one solution for Man to change: he must be immersed in a different context; and there is only one way to change a context: to want to change it, to know how, and to do everything necessary for it. This method certainly presents difficulties, but, if not easy, it is at least realistic. Conversely, the one that consists of preaching to men to change their mindset or behavior seems simpler to implement (which is why it is the most widespread), but it is inherently very complex and totally ineffective. There is indeed nothing harder for a man than to question himself, which implies that only a tiny minority can undertake such a process, and even if they succeed, the real world would not be transformed as a result⁵⁶. Note well that we are not criticizing the virtues of these approaches, the merit of those who engage in them, and the interest they represent from a personal point of view. We are only pointing out the nullity of their results from a social perspective and denouncing the errors on which they rest, namely the belief that Man is solely responsible for everything that concerns him, and the confusion between men and their context. It is this confusion that prevents us from seeing the huge paradox in

55 This exempts us from addressing the question of school, that is, the education or instruction of children, which many see as the primary means of achieving equality. But how can one teach the Principles of Equality when Equality itself is still a mystery? Why teach it at all (if it is possible to do so correctly), with the idea that it will result in something (when we don't know what it consists of), except precisely because it does not yet exist, because the context is inherently unequal?

56 Those who advocate for this kind of method confuse having a new personal vision of the world with truly changing it for all humanity.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

wanting the Man produced by the monetary system to change, without changing what constitutes the very essence of the monetary system, in other words, without attacking Mony. It is also this confusion that conceals the absurdity of wanting men to change so that Equality can exist when men who have never experienced Equality, who do not know what it consists of, inevitably ignore its effects and cannot behave as Citizens they are not and that, from this individualistic perspective, they will never become. We say, therefore, that it is impossible to change Man directly and vain to try, and, on the other hand, it is difficult but possible to change his context. The thing is difficult because it requires not only clear and just ideas about why and how, but also popular support and favorable circumstances. However, by definition, ideas that tend to upset the context, to threaten the system, go against the prejudices they inculcate. Nevertheless, with time, just ideas always make their way into minds until they become irresistible. It is enough then that favorable circumstances rally the people to them for them to triumph⁵⁷.

Finally anchored in reality, yesterday's ideas become the Principles of the new system, the context is transformed, men undergo its effects, and change by force of circumstances. Thus, Man can sometimes change his context, and only the context can surely change Man. But let's note well that this process does not require men to undergo a metamorphosis. Adopting an idea, even a daring one, or adhering to a project, even a revolutionary one, does not imply a fundamental change in thinking and living, becoming another man. Such a metamorphosis has even less reason to be that the ideas in question concern Society, that the project aims to upset the order of things, that the objective is not to change men in the future in itself, and that it advances nothing from this point of view, that they change in the present. Similarly, men who support a social project do not have to live and cannot live in the present according to the laws they advocate for the future. How can one obey desired laws that are not in force, and evade contested laws that are nevertheless applied? Here, for example, we attack Mony, which tends to

57 Thus, among other examples, the First Republic was established in France in 1792, even though there were no declared republicans in 1790. It was Louis XVI who, through his escape in June 1791, planted the idea in many minds that it was possible and desirable to do away with the king. The first movement with a republican tendency was suppressed with bloodshed at the Champ-de-Mars on July 17, 1791. It was the military defeats, desertions, betrayals by officers (all nobles), and threats of reprisals against revolutionaries (Brunswick Manifesto) a year later that prompted the people to overthrow the monarchy and the perjured king on August 10, 1792.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

question currency, but we do not claim that it is possible to do without it in a monetary system.

This leads us to point out once again that a social project cannot and should not be experimented with on a small scale because, on the one hand, it is by nature impossible to implement such a project on any scale other than that of Society, as the conditions are not the same, and on the other hand, the mere fact that it is an experiment would distort the results. Thus, a local experiment that is successful would not prove that the project would be viable on the scale of a nation, and conversely, a failure would not prove that it would not suit a Society⁵⁸. These experiments, therefore, prove nothing, serve no purpose, except to discredit good projects and encourage bad ones, and can only be demanded by generous fools who consider them indispensable and by clever dinosaurs who know them to be impossible or doomed to failure. In fact, a social project cannot be considered based on material evidence that does not exist but must be judged based on its Principles, in the light of common sense.

Finally, citizen, by arguing that Man must change before his context, you forget to specify what he must become, and you neglect an essential thing: that all men will not agree on the answer. You may have your idea on the matter, but your neighbor probably has a different one. Now, given that there are almost as many possible answers as there are individuals, that no one is willing to give up their own, that none is therefore capable of gaining unanimity, how do you hope that from these individual changes, as diverse as they are opposed – assuming that men can really change without changing their context – a new Man will emerge? Assuming, moreover, that the context is produced by men, how do you expect men who exert varied and contradictory effects on the context, canceling each other out, to succeed in changing it? And above all, why do you want the context to change if that is not the goal sought by men, when, on the contrary, their response generally consists of accepting it as it is to better endure it? Thus, in two thousand years, Christianity, as sublime as this doctrine may be, may have given birth to Saints, but it has not changed the world!

⁵⁸ An example is readily available: that of barter. It suits small "societies," but it is unsuitable for larger ones, which, for this reason, adopt currency. It would be ridiculous, therefore, to advocate for the return to barter for the latter under the pretext that all experiences prove it works well among a handful of individuals.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Furthermore, we have not considered the idea that the transformation of men is aimed at changing the context in a specific way. You stated, citizen, that Man must change for Equality to come about. We have already shown how this is absurd, as the main obstacle to Equality is Mony, which men cannot overcome through acrobatics. But let's broaden the perspective and assume that the change in men is assigned the role of modifying anything else in "Society," that is, not what men are but what they do. Now, what men do is determined by the social framework, by laws and other governmental decisions that circumscribe what they can do. There may be flaws in the laws, their effects may be bad, or they may not be as expected. In such cases, they need to be revised, repealed, or strengthened. In any case, men must make decisions or take action for decisions to be made, rather than just contemplating their own fate. In short, laws need to be a subject of reflection, and their change needs to be an objective. Hoping that the context will change after Man has changed himself, in other words, hoping that the laws will be modified without men touching them, without even caring about them, is akin to believing that they can change by the operation of the Holy Spirit and de facto leaves the field open to those who dedicate all their efforts to it. More seriously, this concept, which foolishly freezes many rebels in place, deprives those who, like them but less angelic, want things to change of valuable support and strengthens those who, having the advantage of the context, want things to persist.

Finally, and most importantly, this concept, which, under the pretext of changing "Society," consists of making Man the sole center of interest, the sole object of study and attention, leads individuals to withdraw somewhat into themselves or, at least, not to think enough about Society, about what it is and what it should be. Society is governed by laws that directly or indirectly impose duties on Citizens and define their rights (whether they are legitimate or not is not important here). Changing Society or the social context is therefore changing the laws, redefining duties and rights, defining what a Citizen is. But how can new definitions be found for these concepts if one does not take an interest in them, if one obstinately refuses to be interested in them? In fact, the followers of this extravagant method have only vague or even false ideas about duties, rights, Citizenship, and everything related to

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

social relationships. How, under these conditions, with neither the desire nor the means to change anything at the societal level, could they achieve it?

In conclusion, men can change to some extent while remaining immersed in the same context, but Man cannot. Hoping and advocating that Man changes on his own is therefore demagogic, and waiting or wanting him to change so that his context is changed is nothing less than putting the cart before the horse. Only the context can change Man and impose its morality on him because, of all voices, it is the least contestable. It can certainly be contested, but only by a superhuman effort that men rarely make and that only a desire for JUSTICE can extract from them.

Mrs. Hell: The context matters, but Man is selfish, proud... Sin is within him! Mony responds to his temptation! Eliminating it would not remove sin from the heart of Man, and Mony would reappear sooner or later in another form.

So, citizen, you say that Mony responds to the temptation of Man, in other words, that Man creates Mony to satisfy his inclinations. We could demonstrate the falsehood of this assertion by recalling its origin. Let's simply say that men have less invented Mony than it has imposed itself on them. But, in the end, we care little about where it comes from. It is here. We do not create it. For thousands of years, men have been born with it, and we are in the same situation! And even if men had invented Mony in the dawn of time, why should we be obliged today to respect that invention if it seems disastrous to us? One generation has no right to enslave subsequent generations to its choices; nor does it have the power. For what prevents us from making our own choices and rectifying the errors that may have been made in the past? No one. Therefore, we would be foolish to believe ourselves chained.

We argue that Mony imposed itself on men because, at the time of the first exchanges, they had no alternative for trading other than resorting to barter

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

and the concept of (commodity) value. However, since then, no generation has had a choice. It could not occur to men to question it, and it has perpetuated itself less by their will than by the force of circumstances. This long coexistence has deeply marked men. Money is an integral part of their way of thinking, to the point that they cannot conceive the world without it. Yet, what do men who lived tens of thousands of years ago have in common with ours in the 21st century? We can understand that men are still enthralled by ancestral prejudices and that it may be difficult for them to realize that Money no longer has a reason to exist. However, this trial must enlighten them, and if it appears that we finally have the possibility to eradicate it, we would be cowardly to tolerate it any longer. Worse! No longer ignorant of its guilt and having the power to bring it down, we would no longer be its victims. We would not only be accomplices to its crimes but would fully make ourselves guilty of the plagues it causes, which we point out and that everyone claims to deplore.

In any case, it is false and even ridiculous to say or imply that men born under the reign of Money are responsible for its existence. That they contribute to its conservation and perpetuation, molded in the mold of the monetary system, involuntarily imbued with capitalist prejudices, is one thing. Creating or deliberately adopting it is another entirely.

It follows that it is equally false and ridiculous to claim that Money responds to the temptation of Man, in other words, that it is the fruit of the character of men or a reflection of human nature. If men are fundamentally strangers to its existence, why would Money be a projection of themselves? Now, it is certain that men, in a monetary system, have needs and desires that Money, here in the sense of currency, sometimes allows them to satisfy. But it is the monetary context itself that generates these needs and desires... otherwise, why would Money allow them to be satisfied? It is precisely because, while generating them, it does not always allow them to be satisfied, often leaving them unfulfilled, that it engenders frustration, hence temptation. And it is because this situation is permanent that Money affects the character of men on all levels. We do not deny that the current Man is selfish, prideful, etc., but we also know that we only know Man crushed by Money, forced to calculate and driven to acts that only make sense in a monetary system. You suggest,

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

citizen, that Man, without this weight, would remain bent; we maintain that he could finally straighten up and appear as no one has ever seen him before.

In fact, citizen, you are the one who has succumbed to the temptation to prosecute Man! Note in passing that by falsely declaring that Mony was the embodiment of his sins, you have unintentionally admitted that Mony is an evil. So, to spare your prejudices and avoid thinking, are you ready to sacrifice Humanity to Mony? Learn then, citizen, that Man will never resign himself to chains. No failure will dissuade him from trying again to free himself! It is clear that you draw partly on History for these fatalistic tones. But because Equality does not exist and has never existed, you conclude that Mony is immortal! This takes nothing away from all that History teaches us. Mony did not reappear after any Revolution for the simple reason that none made it disappear because none had that goal, not even the French Revolution that upheld the Principle of Equality. Men were not enlightened enough, and besides, Mony was not ripe. Yet they accomplished unimaginable things for their time, in all fields.

Disregarding all these teachings, you assert that Mony would reappear if it were overthrown! However, by saying that it would reappear in another form, you reveal that you think less about Mony (commodity value) than about currency (standard of value and unit of value). So, you believe that it is pointless to cut the branches since the root of Mony is in Man, as the germ is inexhaustible and would remain intact. This reasoning would be logical if currency indeed coincided with Mony, and if it were true that the latter was the creation of Man.

But currency is both the fruit and the vector of Mony, and it is not men who invent Mony; it is Mony that establishes itself in them because the monetary system in which they are born instills the belief that the notion of (commodity) value is necessary for exchange. Thus, Man is, in a way, a field. He grows what his context sows. So you are right, citizen, when you think that if the currency were cut one year, it would grow back the next. But we do not say that we should content ourselves with mowing down the currency; we say that we must stop sowing Mony in minds and plant something else, which only a non-monetary system can do. We affirm that this would not be useless! Go explain to a farmer who sows alfalfa that he will harvest wheat!

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

To be more explicit, extracting Mony from minds involves substituting another means of exchange for currency, i.e., a means of exchange based on something other than Mony, thus instilling in men another conception of exchange, even better, a (new) conception of Society. As we have said, the only true alternative to currency that has no social dimension and poisons all social relationships would be a means of exchange allowing Citizens to access the market based on their Citizenship. Thus, it would no longer be based on Mony, i.e., on the belief that the notion of (commodity) value is necessary for exchange, but on a fundamental Principle of the social order, namely that only individuals participating in the life of the City and being Citizens have the equal right to access the City's market. It would therefore no longer be a vector of inequalities but of Equality. It would no longer keep individuals in ignorance of social Principles but would make them fully fledged Citizens enjoying their Rights and knowing exactly what a Society should be.

Therefore, how could Mony reappear? The first generation of Citizens would remember the monetary system. But would this memory, in men who dared to defeat Mony, favor its resurgence? Certainly not. Assuming that, in the early days of Equality, difficulties might give rise to regrets, would it even be possible to reintroduce currency? Let's consider what this would imply! The State would have to adopt a currency, issue a certain quantity, and distribute it. But to whom? How? In what proportions? Two possibilities. First, it could distribute them equally among all Citizens. But then, why return to currency, which inevitably would give Citizens infinitely less purchasing power and plunge them back into problems from which they had barely emerged? Moreover, everyone would know that this monetary equality could not last even two days. Therefore, second possibility, the State could consider distributing monetary units unevenly from the start, according to the old criteria of capitalism, if it really has any criteria. But who, after experiencing Equality, would accept becoming the poor of the system? Who would accept that their equal today could be their master tomorrow? Who would even take the risk of being favored initially, i.e., having as much or even less than in Equality, knowing that fortune is capricious and that they could lose everything later? In the end, the return to currency and Mony would encounter resistance in every individual, making it impossible. The likely

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

difficulties we mentioned would not be a pretext to go back. On the contrary, Citizens would find reasons and the energy to move forward.

Suppose now individuals born into Equality, Citizens who have never known the monetary system, enjoying rights attached to Citizenship, incapable of conceiving that it could be otherwise, not conceiving inequality among themselves any more than we conceive of Equality, and furthermore, abhorring capitalism... all of this thanks to the use of a new means of exchange. For Mony to be reborn among them, they would need to feel the need to pay for things and be paid themselves in currency⁵⁹. However, let us always keep in mind that it is because the first producers did not have the possibility of exchanging in any other way that they resorted to bartering, and that we still engage in indirect barter, via currency, not because we want to, but because such are the modes of exchange and thinking into which the monetary system confines us. The adoption of a new means of exchange would be the choice of a generation, a choice made possible by evolution, and would have the same kind of effects as the now-defunct currency, imposing on society a new logic and instilling in Citizens a new way of reasoning. This revolution, unlike previous ones, would not leave a void; it would not make the monetary logic the only one they know, the only one to which they can cling, inevitably bringing about its strong return. No! It would kill this logic by suffocating it under another. Mony would indeed be dead. The notion of commodity value would no longer be involved in purchases, and Citizens would no more understand the utility of currency than the meaning of a price.

But, you might say, Mony would gradually reappear. No! because exchanges cannot rest a little on the notion of value; they cannot be practiced simultaneously according to two logics. Either they are based on the notion of value, or the notion of value does not intervene. However, the latter only comes into play in exchanges carried out through barter or via currency. We also know that barter cannot be the ordinary mode of exchange in a

⁵⁹ Things would not be free in the City. Something is considered free when one acquires or benefits from it without a counterpart. However, in the City, individuals could only consume on the condition that they have participated in the life of the City and are Citizens. Therefore, they would not pay for things in detail, as we do, but through their participation, they would acquire the right of access to everything. Nothing would be free for them, even if nothing would be payable in financial terms. Similarly, working or participating in the life of the City would not be an act of charity or volunteerism since, in return, Citizens would be granted Citizenship, to which their rights would be attached, including the right of access to the market that is currently tied to currency.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

developed society (individuals no longer being producers, and therefore not having any production to barter), and that currency is not established by individuals, not even gradually, but by "Society," suddenly. If society endorses a means of exchange other than currency, Citizens have no choice but to use the means of exchange in force and have no more need for currency than the possibility of instituting one. Mony cannot, therefore, resurrect⁶⁰.

Even admitting that Citizens could still conceive Mony, the question remains whether they would want to make it their master again. It is like asking whether the rich want to become poor or free men want to become slaves. The answer is therefore negative. But some will still say that there would be nostalgics of inequality. Even if that were the case, what could they do? It goes without saying that they would dream of returning to inequality, not to suffer from it, not to be deprived of rights (in which case, they would simply have to abstain from exercising those recognized by Equality), but to be the "lords" of the City and have more rights than their Fellow Citizens. But where would these eccentrics find support? Who among their Fellow Citizens would lend them their support? Who would even lend them an ear? If they dared to proclaim their goal, they would see all Citizens rise against them, worried about their Rights, just as all individuals seem to be united today to defend Mony. They would be equally powerless if they came to power after advancing incognito, for all the reasons we have just given, but also because they would have no "social class" to rely on, the City recognizing no other class than that of Citizens.

It would therefore be as difficult to overturn the means of exchange established by the City as it is today inconceivable for Mony to disappear! In fact, it would be even more difficult because Citizens would then know and enjoy their Rights, and would know that they owe them to this new means of exchange, whereas today they are unaware that money strips them of it! Now, when one knows with what energy and success the privileged defend

60 We are here discussing money as the foundation of the official exchange system. However, it is true that Citizens, as individuals, would always have the option to exchange directly with each other, bypassing the market, without using the means of exchange. They would occasionally engage in barter or even gift exchanges. However, these marginal exchanges would not challenge the general mode of exchanges and would not resurrect money, which arises from the equivalence of objects. By definition, the concept of market value does not come into play in gift exchanges. But it would not come into play in what Citizens would call barter either because, in the City, objects would no longer embody rights and would no longer have market value on the market. Citizens would not seek to assign market value to them in the context of their private exchanges. Barter would then involve exchanging between individuals without establishing an equivalence of value between objects.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

illegitimate rights, one understands that it would be impossible for a handful of nostalgics, without means, without a just cause, to subdue Citizens, placed in the same situation as the privileged, ready to defend their legitimate Rights to the death.

Mr Cupid: But won't men always want to be or have more than their neighbors? Even without Mony, Citizens would seek to trample each other and find ways to defraud one another!

Citizen, the City's function would not be to change Man but to recognize and guarantee the Rights of Citizens. If equal Citizens, as men, were always to be jealous of their neighbors without being able to harm them, what does it matter?

That being said, we need to understand the true meaning of your question. You say, "won't men always want to be or have more than their neighbor?" It is evident that, by "having more," you are referring to possessions. Thus, you imply that Citizens would always want to possess more than their neighbors. This is indeed what someone might believe who is ignorant of Equality, who attributes a capitalist mentality to Citizens, and who, in fact, is unaware of the effects of Mony on himself and his contemporaries. Before considering what men might want in Equality, it is therefore necessary to ask ourselves why they want to have under Mony.

Under the reign of Mony, and especially today, all rights are mediated by currency. Earning it is an absolute necessity and becomes for many a reason for living. It is legitimate not to want to be poor in the midst of a wealthy civilization, and it is even necessary to appear rich because everything is judged by the yardstick of wealth. Money is used to buy. Possessions testify to wealth, which implies virtues. It is more important to have Mony (in the sense of currency) and possessions than to have the virtues that this implies. Having possessions is even more important than having Mony because they

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

can be displayed and presume a wealth that, even if imaginary, makes an impression on the observer. Thus, the obsession with Having surpasses the desire to Be. The monetary system and even more so capitalism are not materialistic by chance! To have to shine and shine to have money! This mentality cannot be explained without Mony... nor can it outlast it! Why would one want to have more than one's neighbor if having no longer meant anything because, in Equality, everyone would have the same Rights and could potentially have the same possessions? Property would no longer be associated with ideas of wealth and virtue. Having would be a personal satisfaction and, in the eyes of others, proof of nothing. If men always need and desire to have, so be it! But if Citizens still wanted to have to have more than their neighbors—meaning to have possessions that others disdain or could not acquire due to lack of luck—that would no longer make any sense! In fact, they would care about what their neighbors consume and possess roughly as much as we currently care about how much air ours breathe!

Regarding the aspect of "being more," it all depends, citizen, on what you mean by that. Initially, you might have been thinking of being more financially prosperous. But how could Citizens, outside of a monetary system, desire to be financially wealthier than one another, especially when the concepts of wealth and poverty would no longer exist? Now, if you were considering being more beautiful, more loved, taller, more cultured, more intelligent, more famous, etc., then yes, Citizens would probably still want to be more than their neighbors. However, would it be for the same reasons and have the same consequences as in a monetary system?

In a monetary system, the feeling of being less or being considered less than others often stems from being less wealthy than them. In these conditions, how do people hope or believe they can reveal who they are to others or make others believe they are more than they really are if not by becoming rich, richer than they were, and if possible, richer than their neighbors? Can one deny that wealth is perceived as the miracle cure? It erases all flaws and highlights qualities, even those one doesn't possess⁶¹. The opposite is just as

⁶¹ Indeed, money diverts most individuals from what is honorable in life or essential for society, resulting in the creation of ignoble individuals and soulless societies.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

true and even more dramatic, as poverty often leads to attributing imaginary flaws to the poor and denying their real qualities.

So, whatever the reason for which people envy their neighbors, it is often through wealth that they believe they can compete with them. But, one might argue, isn't this a good thing, as it promotes the dynamism of the system? Unfortunately, one does not get rich with clean hands; fortune is always built on someone else's back. This is the second major difference between capitalists and Citizens.

To be more than their fellow citizens in a particular area, what could Citizens do? Unable to distinguish themselves through possessions, through having, unless they want to be seen as notorious fools, and having no means to appear to be something they are not, they would have two alternatives: either surpass their fellow citizens in that particular area or outclass them in another. In any case, they would have to be or become something, strive to be, or else, lacking the will or talent, suppress their jealousy. But, in no case, could they rise at the expense of the rights of others. In Equality, the desire to be more would remain and would also generate dynamism but with different effects than under Mony.

But, citizen, your question was more subtle. It concealed an assertion: men will always be selfish. Selfish about what? What is selfishness, anyway, other than being excessively preoccupied with oneself, and what generates it if not the fear of being dispossessed? Isn't the first consequence of Mony to strip Citizens of their Rights? Never safe, constantly forced to defend themselves and conquer rights at the expense of others, people have little respite to think of anything other than themselves. They are like the crow holding a piece of cheese in its beak and must resist all emotions for fear of letting it escape. They argue over a cake they made together, and Mony cuts it into unequal portions. Regardless of the size of these portions, they arouse the covetousness of foxes and the selfishness of all. They keep accounts as they would number their slaughter. Mony does not invite them to a feast but to a brawl. Yet, during a feast where everyone is free to help themselves from the abundant table, there are always leftovers and never any quarrels among the guests. The one who is hungry eats to his heart's content; the one with a bird's appetite watches him eat without envy. Who boasts of having eaten

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

more than others? Who feels aggrieved for having eaten their fill? Forgetting their plates, haven't the guests shared more than a meal? Why would Citizens be selfish if, whatever they do, they didn't have to watch their own bowl and that of their neighbor?

Finally, citizen, to encompass the subject, let's address the recurring and somewhat indecent supplementary question: Will men accept that their neighbors have as much as they do? Or, why should my neighbor have as much as I do?

Firstly, let us recall that, in equality of rights, equality in possessions would only be possible in theory. Therefore, Citizens would not have the same properties; they would only have the same rights. But would they have the same possessions, could they rebel against equality? Could they revert to inequality and monetary systems? We have seen earlier that this would be impossible. They would be forced to accept this situation, and, in truth, no longer assigning the importance to possessions that we currently do, they wouldn't even pose the question. In fact, they would ask the opposite question; they would wonder how "Citizens" could have accepted being unequal in rights for so long, how they could have suffered seeing their dignity violated for so long. Because, do not forget, jurors citizens, that we now only have the title of Citizens, and some bestow it upon you to lull you to sleep, while others, fortunately, bestow it upon you to awaken you! Being equal neither among ourselves nor in front of "Society," the City does not exist, and citizenship at the present time is merely a smoke screen, a concept relatively devoid of meaning. We live in the same place, but side by side, enemies of each other, suspicious of each other, exploited by each other.

All these questions betray the mindset imposed by the context in which we live. Individuals as skeptical about equality and its virtues as they are eager to justify inequality must necessarily come from an unequal context. Similarly, only Citizens (de facto or in conscience) can applaud equality and its consequences and be inversely dismayed by inequality and the monetary system. But something is still strange and paradoxical about the former. While they are individualistic, mainly concerned with themselves, at the thought that their neighbors could finally enjoy their rights, they suddenly become interested in them to contest them and thus compromise the common

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

happiness. Instead of thinking about themselves and all that Equality would bring them, their first reaction is, for once, to think about others and abhor the idea that their fellow citizens could have as much as themselves. Yet, what does it matter to them if their neighbors access comfort as long as they themselves lose nothing and gain at least in tranquility? Because what happens when some have next to nothing at the expense of others who have something? Those who have nothing inevitably do everything to have something, taking from those who have, even if it's little. The latter must, therefore, remain constantly on their guard, under the risk of being robbed, attacked, kidnapped, or even killed⁶². Equality is, therefore, in the interest of all. But the disdain of opulence for poverty is such that it leads to a gross error. It is not the poor who demand equality but the principles of social order; and it is not intelligent people who disapprove of it, but proud and foolish beings. Individuals with such a short-sighted view will not obstruct its progress. They could even, through their clumsiness, hasten its advent⁶³.

Let's close this parenthesis and come, citizen, to the second part of your intervention. You say that even without Mony, citizens would seek to harm each other and would find a way to defraud one another! But why do you say this? Because that is our reality. We are surrounded by fraudsters. Fraud even becomes the subject of television programs. This scourge seems so

⁶² There is probably no need to go into lengthy explanations regarding the various forms of theft to which the rich, in particular, are subjected, and all they do to prevent it. As for kidnappings, consider, for example, Brazil where scarcely a day goes by without a member of a wealthy family being abducted for ransom. However, when it comes to being killed, it is not during ordinary times that the rich and privileged are most exposed, even if the risk is never zero, but rather when a revolution occurs, more precisely, the first phase of the Revolution. (The Revolution, which is meant to witness the triumph of Equality, necessarily unfolds in two phases separated in time. The first phase, with Equality as its leitmotif, confronts the privileged head-on, who, being the beneficiaries of inequality, seem to be its sole culprits. The ensuing struggle, prompted by the resistance of some and the frustration of others, diverts the attention of revolutionaries from money, assuming they were concerned about it before. Whether the revolutionaries emerge victorious in the struggle or are defeated, the revolution itself is destined to fail, in the sense that, under no circumstances, can it give birth to Equality, and eventually leads to capitalism or, more precisely, to capitalo-liberalism. However, this first phase is necessary for people to draw lessons from this failure and understand, in the long run, that inequality and tyranny are less the result of other individuals than of money itself, and that Equality cannot and should not be based on human will. All past revolutions, whether in France in 1789, Russia in 1917, China in 1949, or elsewhere, were of this first type.)

⁶³ All revolutions are not only prompted by oppressors but set in motion by those who have everything to lose. From this perspective, the French Revolution is exemplary. For years, the nobility undermined the authority of the king, sawing off the branch on which they were sitting, while at the same time embittering the people by solidifying their privileges. Their refusal to replenish the state coffers led to the convocation of the Estates-General, providing the nation with the opportunity to stand up. To top it all off, Louis XVI, eager to regain his former power and counting on foreign powers, declared war on the Emperor of Austria, only to lose it, and military setbacks convinced the revolutionaries to overthrow him. War often serves as the catalyst for revolutions. Despots believe they will find glory in it, but often, as exemplified by Napoleon III or Nicholas II, they only hasten their downfall.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

natural, so human to you that you cannot conceive it disappearing with Mony, which gives rise to it. You want to believe forcefully that people, placed in conditions beyond your understanding, would still seek and always find a way to defraud.

Let's assume, however, citizen, that you are right, that equality would not eliminate fraudsters. Is that an argument against equality and in favor of Mony? Why anxiously raise the specter of a plague that, for us, is not a supposition but a reality? Why, moreover, do you not invoke this reality against Mony instead of assuming that equality would reproduce it? In short, if equality also had its share of fraudsters, this should in no way dissuade us from instituting it to enjoy all the benefits that Mony deprives us of.

Now, to respond more precisely, we must first define what fraud is. According to dictionaries, it is an action that consists of seizing someone else's property, appropriating it through fraudulent means, through deceit. However, we know that, in a monetary system, goods represent value, money, and therefore rights. Defrauding someone is thus less about subtly robbing them of their possessions or money than about obtaining rights at their expense. As for the means used by fraudsters, they are called fraudulent because they violate laws. But how many fraudulent acts do laws, under Mony, have to cover? Because we see that defrauding, obtaining rights at the expense of others, resembles normal monetary exchanges, with the most common fraud being selling something worthless at a high price. Unlike thieves who forcibly rob their victims and openly violate laws, fraudsters abuse trust and defraud with the victim's consent; they operate on the edge of legality, even in the name of the law, making it difficult to recognize or prosecute them.

Let's therefore remember that the goal of fraudsters is to obtain rights at the expense of others, in the form of goods or money. It is perfectly understandable that, in a monetary system, individuals become fraudsters: it generally pays more than working, although it can sometimes be costly. Moreover, fraud is made possible by the fact that rights are materialized, anonymous, and intended to change hands. In other words, the monetary system provides individuals with both a motive and a means; money gives them both the will to become fraudsters and the possibility of defrauding. The

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

question that remains is whether citizens would want and could defraud each other.

Citizens would be equal in rights. Equality would be guaranteed by a means of exchange allowing merchants to verify the citizenship of their customers, granting each of them a theoretically unlimited purchasing power. The right to access the market of a citizen would be exercised through this means of exchange but would fundamentally be attached to the citizen themselves. Citizens, being able to obtain everything possible due to their citizenship, would have no reason to covet the belongings of others. A citizen could not increase their right to market access at the expense of another since this right would be unlimited and strictly personal for everyone. In essence, a citizen could not relinquish their rights, and no one could take them away. To enjoy the rights of another citizen, without being able to snatch them away, a fraudster would have no choice but to compel them to exercise those rights in their favor. Let's imagine that today's fraudsters, instead of robbing their victims of their possessions, are forced to drag them into stores at gunpoint to make purchases for them, and this scenario repeats every time they want something. It would be extremely inconvenient! To be honest, such a thing would be impossible! Well, what is impossible today would still be impossible in the city. Assuming, nevertheless, that there are still fraudsters, one could no longer speak of fraud since citizens "defrauded" could not lose anything, except for time, as they cannot be deprived of their rights. The true victims of fraudsters would, in fact, be the city, from which they would usurp rights and to which they would fail in all their duties. Fraudsters would, in short, be considered public enemies.

Thus, in equality, an individual would have no alternative to obtain rights, all possible rights, other than becoming a citizen by participating in the life of the city. Fraudsters would be eradicated, not because people would be better, but because the system would be just, because the means of exchange would no longer be flawed, because rights would no longer offer vulnerabilities, being no longer materialized by wandering units as they are with currency, and because defrauding would be impossible and uninteresting.

You argue, citizen, that citizens would still find a way to defraud each other. But what could they possibly defraud? Money? There wouldn't be any! The

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

means of exchange? It would be inalienable! Goods? They would represent nothing! There are no other objects of fraud than these. Pure and simple theft would certainly not be impossible in theory, but what interest would citizens, who could access everything and derive no right from objects, have in stealing⁶⁴? Theft today is motivated by gain, by the rights that the stolen object will directly (if it is money) or indirectly (if it is an object to resell) provide; it is not a gratuitous act. Why would people still engage in it if it became pointless? Especially since stealing rights to survive would not only be useless, difficult, illegal, and dangerous, but also impossible. Unlike money, which encourages and allows choosing dishonest paths to obtain it, Equality would leave no other paths to enjoy all the rights of a citizen than the path of duty. It is understandable that, under Mony, people might conceive their interests differently and opt for more or less respectable means to survive. But who, in equality, facing an all-or-nothing alternative, could see their interest elsewhere than in citizenship and, consequently, honesty? Who, without any valid reason, would go so blatantly against their own interests? Equality would not overturn human nature to such an extent!

Mr Blind: Nevertheless, Mister Accuser, without Mony, we wouldn't be where we are now! Mony is a factor of progress!

Indeed, citizen, we wouldn't be where we are without Mony! This is as true for progress, which would be much more advanced, as for our problems, most of which wouldn't exist! But, even if not entirely clear-sighted, by stating that Mony drives us towards progress, you have nevertheless acknowledged an influence that many deny. Consider this when, on another subject, you argue that it is absolutely neutral!

⁶⁴ Rare or unique objects could still, it seems, be subject to theft. However, the interest in acquiring them in this way would be much less than the interest in remaining a Citizen. Collectors are often sponsors themselves; they do not steal directly. But who would steal for them when the collectors couldn't offer anything in return, at least nothing that would rival the Rights of the Citizen?

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

It was in the nature of things that, emerging from primitive society, when men invented new products, discovered new manufacturing techniques, adopted new lifestyles, and increased exchanges among themselves, it was in the nature of things, we say, that Mony would appear through barter and soon manifest itself in the form of currency. But one must not reverse the roles. It is because the genius of Man set in motion that the old forms of exchange became inadequate and a new mode of exchange, based on Mony, on the concept of market value, imposed itself. Moreover, it was only much later that new economic or political necessities imposed the use of currency, which is both a standard of market value and a medium of exchange. In other words, it is not Mony that pushed Man towards progress; it is Man who, in his forward march, eventually conceived it. Similarly, money allows or at least facilitates (compared to barter) exchanges, but it is men who invent and produce the exchanged objects. Mony and currency do not give Man any capacity. Being intelligent can make one rich, but wealth itself has never made anyone intelligent, to say the least! The source of human progress is in Man and in him alone. Man advances when he exploits his capacities, and he does not need the approval of Mony to exploit them.

The knowledge and level of development of a given civilization result from past and present discoveries, inventions, experiences, and reflections. Each stage serves as an unshakeable support to reach the next stage. There is no possible turning back. Human progress only knows forward movement⁶⁵. The question, therefore, is not whether Mony is a factor of progress, since Man is its only author, but whether it can hinder it.

What were you thinking, citizen, when making this reflection? Were you thinking that we have achieved a certain progress under the influence of Mony? That Mony generates frustrations and forward escapes that resemble dynamism? That capitalo-liberalism has been the stage for technological explosion? And then? This indicates that Man is advancing, but it does not prove in any way that Mony makes him advance! In fact, the spectacular progress made in the last two centuries is due to two causes: the first is the

65 One might even be tempted to say accelerated forward, as the accumulation of discoveries a priori allows for faster discoveries. But can the acceleration of discoveries, undeniable over the last two centuries, continue indefinitely? Will knowledge not reach a point at which it becomes more difficult, and therefore rarer, to make new discoveries, assuming there are still things left to discover? Since it is impossible to answer these questions with certainty, it is not permissible to present the acceleration of progress as an immutable rule.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

one we have already mentioned, namely that accumulated knowledge should lead to new discoveries; the second is the end of the old regime which, due to individual or collective privileges, hindered economic activity. With the bourgeoisie coming to power, Mony ascended the throne. Finally free to move, the bourgeois indulged themselves, and it is under these conditions that progress accelerated on the technical level. Despite what we have said, it seems that there is a close correlation between Mony and the progress made during that time.

Some will explain that the possibility of making a fortune encourages entrepreneurship, the spread of new discoveries, and even investment in research, and therefore Mony is indeed a factor of progress. But this argument is circular because the monetary system is compared to itself or, more precisely, is not compared to another. This explanation is essentially a statement of human activity and an attempt to attribute all credit to Mony, as it explicitly assumes that without it, a factor of progress would disappear, and it implies that without it, progress would become impossible, even regression. But it ignores the fact that the freedom to undertake is now granted only to the rich, so there are fewer entrepreneurs and inventions or discoveries spread than if all citizens genuinely had the opportunity to undertake, not to mention the healthier motives that would drive them; that the freedom of some results in the exploitation of others, the employees, i.e., the vast majority of consumers, so progress spreads less quickly than if all citizens had access to new products without waiting for what is called "price democratization" (when it happens); that research is the poor relative of capitalism, so discoveries, which nothing prevents, since only passionate people dedicate themselves to research, are not due to Mony.

Now, suppose a non-monetary society based on an egalitarian means of exchange: would discoveries and inventions be neglected? Imagine that individuals have rights only if they are citizens, and being a citizen implies participating in the life of the city: would individuals need to work less? Would geniuses stop following their inspiration? Would discoverers and inventors keep their findings to themselves? Would producers seek to retain their production within their hands? Imagine further that citizens, as consumers, have theoretically unlimited purchasing power, genuinely superior to that of

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

today: would new products not spread much faster, ensuring quick success for inventors? Further imagine that companies are always in competition⁶⁶: would innovation (whether in products, production techniques, etc.) not remain an objective? Would the strong demand mentioned not stimulate innovations of all kinds? Finally, imagine that the people have never been kept in ignorance, which was inevitable in inequality, that knowledge has always been accessible to all citizens: who knows if the progress made in the 20th century despite long unfavorable conditions would not have been achieved in the 10th?

Be not mistaken: it is not the rise to power of Mony that favored progress; it is the end of the old regime that allowed more freedoms to more people, mainly to the bourgeois. The more there are freedoms, the more a society is just, the richer it is. However, freedom itself, the freedom that citizens would enjoy in equality, would not be a factor of progress in itself, since fundamentally, it would bring nothing to man, nor take anything away from him; it would simply allow him to cultivate genius and deploy all the energy within him. One cannot, all the more reason, say that Mony is a factor of progress, as it guarantees great freedoms to a few but takes away these same freedoms from the vast majority. In fact, far from being a factor of progress, Mony is an obstacle to progress. Between all the harm that men do for it, all the energy they spend in vain chasing after it, and all they cannot do because of it⁶⁷, do the math! Take a sector of your choice, judge without prejudice, and you will see that Mony, in general, is a limiting factor! On the highway of progress, it sets up tolls that slow down the march of man. Certainly, a toll does not prevent passage, but it wastes time for nothing!

⁶⁶ It is a widespread mistake to believe that Equality prohibits competition and liberalism. Equality prescribes that Citizens should be equal in Duties and Rights. The City defines the Duties and guarantees the Rights. Now, to the extent that the City recognizes the existence of a business, it acknowledges that its employees fulfill their Duty (to participate in the life of the City) and thus guarantees them the Rights of the Citizen (including the right to benefit from its advantages, notably by accessing the market). Therefore, businesses can compete and be sanctioned by the City if necessary without infringing on the Rights of the employees. Liberalism remains an economic stimulant but is no longer a social scourge. (Liberalism has never been a scourge, as it has never existed; we have only known and could only know capitalo-liberalism, i.e., a liberalism distorted and corrupted by money.)

⁶⁷ Think of all the untapped and buried patents to preserve some interest, the inevitable lack of financial means, the time needed to gather (if it can be achieved at all) the essential budget to successfully carry out a project, etc.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Once again, citizen, you have attributed to Mony the wonders of which man is capable, while your neighbor has previously attributed to men alone the crimes of which Mony is the instigator. Do you not feel, jurors citizens, how much Mony permeates your minds and distorts, to its advantage and to the detriment of humanity, your vision of things? It is finally time to proclaim it loud and clear: **MONY IS A TYRANT!** The oldest and most powerful tyrant of all time. It imposed itself on men without their knowledge; it annihilates the principles of political association; it establishes or solidifies inequality and then makes it unalterable; it seizes rights, materializes them, and strips men of them; it disposes of freedoms and outrages the dignity of citizens; it dictates laws superior to all that men can conceive; it inspires almost all vices and commands only crimes; it plunges individuals, enterprises, and states into an infernal circle; it has its court, its servants, its satellites, its slaves, and its victims, like despots, its religion, its temple, and its priests, like gods; it demands that men sacrifice everything to it: the present, the future, the earth, the air, the water, the fauna, the flora... themselves! Jurors citizens, is this enough to make Mony guilty in your eyes, or is it not yet tyrannical enough?

Mrs Hell: You demonize Mony!

No "demonization" here, citizen! We simply state what Mony is and what it leads people to, neither more nor less, without the naivety of considering it the immaculate Virgin! We have explained the principles and shown the facts, at least the mechanisms that generate them. Yes! they are terrible, even more terrible than we have suggested. But if that does not make Mony a demon, it nonetheless makes it a tyrant! The very proof of its tyranny is in the fear of men to denounce it and in their obstinacy not to want to see it, even though it is glaringly obvious! Certainly, not everything can be attributed to it, but to attribute nothing to it when so many tragic and sordid things clearly owe everything to it would be demagogic, and to acknowledge its responsibilities without condemning it would be criminal! Now, it is up to you to be consistent

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

with yourself! Just know that our fate, each one of us, depends on your judgment!

JUSTICE must be firm as firmness must be just. We have exposed the crimes of Mony; we must now present the facts in its defense. In truth, Mony can escape only one accusation: that of treason. For it is indeed men who, even involuntarily, have brought it into being. It has only obeyed the unchanging nature that was given to it. But let this extenuating circumstance not stop your hand, as you would not hesitate to strike a wolf on the pretext that it was born a wolf. It is in its nature to be your enemy, and by that, you are his. You have the Right and even the Duty to defend yourselves, and it is vital that you defeat it. But do not blame Man for having committed this error despite himself; repair it or reproach yourself for repeating it.

On the other hand, the argument often put forward in its defense, and the only one that can withstand even the least pertinent analysis, is in no way in its favor. This is the alleged fact that Mony would be a practical means of exchange.

Even if this were the case, does the practical aspect of a thing compensate, erase, or excuse the drawbacks it may have in other areas? Why should we care if Mony is a practical means of exchange if it allows the violation of all the Principles of social order? How does that speak in its favor? For when looking, even from a distance, at everything practical with Mony, the argument immediately turns against it. It is then absurd to reproach men for their ways of using it and to praise Mony for its practical aspect when it itself opens the door to all abuses!

Moreover, this practical aspect does not concern Mony but currency, i.e., its support. Currency is the means of exchange; Mony is the principle or essence of monetary exchange, a principle without which the existence of currency would make no sense. Remember that we do not judge the body that executes but the mind that commands. However, jurors citizens, a principle is good or bad, just or unjust, true or false, but it cannot be practical or inconvenient. It is therefore ridiculous to invoke this argument to defend Mony.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Moreover, a thing is necessarily judged practical in comparison to another that is less so. In the case of money, this can mean two things: either that using money is more practical than exchanging goods directly, or that money is a more practical means of exchange than others.

In the first scenario, it is evident that the use of money offers certain conveniences compared to bartering, as it is precisely the means that humans, in their quest for convenience, have found to perpetuate exchange between individuals and manipulate the concept of market value born from bartering. Its support has also evolved to satisfy the same concern⁶⁸. Money has not questioned the logic of bartering; monetary exchange consists of an indirect barter, but bartering has become increasingly abstract through more manageable currencies. Exchanges, so to speak, became easier through its use, but less and less just. Therefore, the practical aspect of money becomes irrelevant if its usage is socially harmful, even more harmful than the practice of bartering.

As for the second scenario, in which money would be more practical than other means of exchange, it makes no sense.

How can one compare two means of exchange involving different principles? Money is practical compared to bartering, as it perpetuates the logic of individualistic exchange in its own way, but it cannot be the means of exchange in a system where exchanges are based on another logic, the logic of social exchange. This system would require a means of exchange in line with its own logic, a means of exchange that cannot be money. There is therefore no possible comparison between the means of exchange of radically different systems, each being simply in line with the logic of its system, and none being able to replace another in its function, even poorly.

Furthermore, jurors citizens, how can one claim that money is a more practical means of exchange than another, even when no other is conceived? Undoubtedly, those who make such an assertion do not imagine any other means of exchange than money. In their mouths, this statement is therefore

⁶⁸ The first forms of currency were goods (shells, stones, animals, etc.) or objects (axes, spades, fabrics, jewelry, etc.), followed by reference goods (metals, cereals, salt, etc.) whose quantity generally needed to be weighed (these goods could serve as either currency or units of account). Next came coins (or metal objects often realistically or conventionally representing the original currency) issued by the state or wealthy individuals, deriving their value from the quantity of metal they contained or the issuer's intent. After that came banknotes with a value set by the state, followed by virtual units representing the concept of market value in its purest form, without any artifacts.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

baseless. But even if some indeed have in mind other means of exchange (other than derivatives of money), and some even know the means of exchange specific to Equality, it would still be ridiculous on their part, due to what we have just said, to establish such a comparison.

It follows from all this that money, the only means of exchange in line with the monetary system and the only one we know today, is neither more nor less practical than another means of exchange, but it is practical as a means of exchange. By this, we mean that money shares with all possible means of exchange certain properties that do facilitate exchanges compared to the first known form of exchange, direct exchange between individuals. However, this compliment does not apply to the specific properties of money, which are regrettable.

What are the common properties of any means of exchange? Firstly, any means of exchange, whatever it may be, is recognized by all parties involved in the exchange and alone confers the right to access the market⁶⁹, that is, to the production (goods or services) of others. It establishes as private property the goods removed from the market through its use. Its usage assumes that products of all kinds are distributed according to individual initiatives, not by the authority of the State. It is theoretically obtained either through participation in the life of the City or through the grace of the latter. It is supposed to be, for a seller, the guarantee of the participation of his client in the life of the Society or at least his right to participate legitimately in the exchange, i.e., to take away his products or enjoy his services. It implies that individuals no longer work for themselves but for the market, in order to obtain it. Finally, its usage by buyers attests in one way or another to the activity of the sellers, who in turn deserve to dispose of it.

Thus, to satisfy all their needs and desires, individuals just need to acquire the means of exchange of the system in which they live. They then no longer produce for themselves but for the market, and no longer have to exchange their production directly, which sometimes does not lend itself well to direct exchange, especially as they often produce in groups and therefore have nothing of their own to exchange. A means of exchange thus promotes the diversification of productions, particularly in terms of services, enables trading

⁶⁹ The fact that a means of exchange alone grants the right to access the market does not exclude the possibility that exchanges can still take place, albeit marginally, between individuals through barter. (See Note 60)

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

on a much larger scale, and offers incomparable freedoms. These are the fundamental advantages of using a means of exchange over the practice of bartering! However, while money theoretically confirms the general picture, in practice, it falls far short of fulfilling all the specific requirements. Moreover, while these different aspects are insufficient to define a means of exchange in line with the expectations of Citizens, they go far beyond what is necessary to characterize money.

Money is indeed recognized by all parties involved in the exchange since it is currently instituted by the State. It also seems fair, at first glance, to say that it alone confers the right to access the market. Therefore, the first departure from the Principles is that the right to access the market, a right that should be recognized to Citizens by the City, is not recognized to individuals by the State but is conferred by money, which also consecrates private ownership of everything that has been paid for. Furthermore, while the right to access the market is theoretically given only by money, the fact that monetary exchange consists of an exchange of values implies that everything represents value and can, in some cases, either be exchanged (not as a means of exchange but as an object of exchange), thereby conferring the same right as money, or be sold, thus providing money. It is needless to specify that money can be obtained other than by working, that it does not prove to sellers that their clients have worked to obtain it, and that it cannot serve the function of being such proof. Finally, it is exaggerated to say that, in a monetary system, individuals no longer work for themselves but for the market because, in reality, they still own their production or their (labor force), which they must, according to the logic of bartering, exchange for money. This is evident for independent workers who work alone and sell their products or services directly (which are thus initially their property), but it is no less true for employees of a company who work not for the market or the City but for the company that pays them a salary, so they derive their rights from their company, not the City.

We observe, fellow citizens, that money introduces significant ambiguity regarding its acquisition and functions more as a means of obtaining goods than facilitating direct exchanges of labor. Indeed, monetary transactions are

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

surrounded by as many liberties as rights freed from responsibilities and devoid of safeguards.

Hence, it is crucial not to conflate money, a means of exchange brought forth by Mony, with the broader concept of a means of exchange. Money is condemnable not inherently as a medium of exchange, but rather as an instrument of Mony. The destinies of Mony and money are entwined, even though a means of exchange is evidently necessary at present. Thus, persisting with Mony due to a lack of imagination for an alternative means of exchange beyond money or prohibiting money and the very idea of a means of exchange by rejecting Mony are both errors to avoid. The former perpetuates the malevolence of Mony, while the latter forfeits all the benefits of indirect exchange. These errors converge to the same endpoint: the monetary system.

It is evident that the more common mistake is to persist with money and Mony, given that our world remains entrenched in the monetary paradigm, and people often naively believe that change can occur without altering their behaviors. In the best-case scenario, this mistake entails hoping for Equality without questioning the role of money, which effectively translates into repeatedly encountering the constraints imposed by Mony and moving in circles within the monetary system⁷⁰. On the other hand, the less common mistake, namely, the prohibition of any means of exchange, requires audacity but also tends to be driven by excessive idealism. This perspective essentially hopes for Equality within an egalitarian "Society," where everyone is envisaged to be equal in all aspects, including possessions.

Without a means of exchange, the distribution of goods can only occur in three ways: through barter, anarchically, or by the intervention of the State. Barter, with its individualistic exchange principle, contradicts communal Principles and is thus excluded from consideration. However, in a scenario where neither a means of exchange nor State control over individual activities and exchanges exists, resulting in the freedom to consume without an obligation to work, anarchy prevails. This leads to a situation where no form of equality, whether in rights or possessions, is conceivable, even in theory.

⁷⁰ The monetary system is, in a way, a prison whose walls are invisible yet prevent seeing through. Men are thus ignorant both that they are prisoners, that they have a wall to cross to be free, and what Equality consists of, which they can only find outside this enclosure.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Consequently, the only remaining alternative is the third one: distribution through State intervention.

Proposals to eliminate money and the use of any means of exchange, as a reaction to Mony, stem from the desire to establish a form of Equality⁷¹ and imply an obsession with egalitarian ideals. In such systems, everyone is expected to contribute their share of labor — a norm for Citizens. Production is supposed to be distributed equally so that everyone possesses the same as their neighbor. However, at this juncture, the distortion of the Principle of Equality becomes apparent. The State, or any other supreme authority, is mandated to oversee all aspects and engage comprehensively to align everything with this impractical principle. Consequently, to avoid the perils of anarchy, "Society" inevitably descends into tyranny. Without a means of exchange, equality in possessions becomes the only conceivable form of equality, notwithstanding its absurdity, injustice, impracticability, and tragic consequences in practice.

Once again, everything revolves around exchange, and today, the prohibition of any means of exchange would be even more dramatic than the use of money. Without introducing Principles into the "City" that are as just as they are new, conveyed by a means of exchange, it would either continue to be a monetary system or quickly revert to barter before rapidly returning to money —essentially back to square one. Furthermore, annihilating freedoms in the name of material equality would amount to destroying Equality itself, which would be worse than retaining Mony and its inequalities. In the former case, inequalities would persist, or even worsen, while the freedoms that Mony still allows would be stifled. Although such projects demonstrate a definite aversion to the injustices of capitalo-liberalism and deep generosity, they are destined for total failure.

It is worth noting, however, fellow citizens, that there are societies that do not use any means of exchange, yet they do not experience the failure we predict. However, these are communities reduced to a few members, whereas such projects are intended for extended, overpopulated, developed societies with long-established monetary systems. Solidarity prevails among the members of these communities due to their proximity or even kinship.

⁷¹ This kind of project is necessarily based on a desire for Equality since it aims to eliminate the inequalities inherent in money.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

This is a principle that capitalism has undermined, and therefore, it cannot be relied upon a priori, especially since the City must be built upon the firm Principles of social order rather than vague notions of camaraderie.

It must be understood that there is no going back⁷², that direct or indirect barter is forever outdated, that the primitive community is but a bucolic dream, and that we must advance from where we have arrived. Renouncing a means of exchange is impossible; retaining Mony is untenable! Moreover, it is worth noting that attacking Mony may still seem eccentric, but every time people seek to solve social problems and improve their relationships, they imagine a new concept of exchange, or at the very least, a new way of manipulating money. Despite their claims that Mony (in the sense of currency) is neutral, when they criticize the capitalist "Society" and contemplate reacting, they advocate either a change in attitude toward it—something impossible since this mentality is the result of its existence—or parallel trading alongside monetary exchanges, living on the fringes of "Society," or fleeing to a country where barter still competes with money. In all cases, Mony is directly responsible for their discomfort and their reactions that lack insight and ambition!

Fellow citizens, Mony is currently under a concerted attack, but it is already contested. While everyone understands the limitations of barter, everyone knows that it is fairer than monetary exchange. Although fairness is insufficient for Citizens⁷³, it is an improvement for the exploited, the excluded, and those outraged by the injustice and absurdity of capitulo-liberalism. Thus, barter has reappeared as a response to the monetary system, as an initial blow struck against Mony. Currently, in the heart of our cities, exchange is sometimes practiced in a manner that combines both barter and monetary exchange, namely the Local Exchange Trading System (S.E.L.). S.E.L. is clearly a hostile reaction to Mony. However, barter itself is based on Mony. In fact, S.E.L. is based on the same foundation as the classical monetary system it rebels against. Moreover, money is an evolution of barter.

⁷² Let it be clear to everyone that annihilating money is a step forward, not backward, contrary to what those on the other side may claim. They pretend to ignore that merely seeking to reduce financial problems and their offspring is nothing more than wanting to return to a past time and an idealized situation.

⁷³ Equity, the basic principle of monetary exchange, is wielded as the sword of justice but is only the shield of money and inequality. It is the illusory last resort of those who do not want Equality or do not know how to establish it.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Therefore, an intermediate mode of exchange can only be a regression. Besides, S.E.L. stands for Local Exchange System. Compared to the monetary system that allows exchanges at the national and even international levels, this system can only be a marginal palliative. Its generalization is by definition impossible or predestined for failure.

As we have stated, the fall of Mony will occur when two developments are in harmony: the sentiment of the "Citizens" towards it and the evolution of Mony itself, or more precisely, that of currency. This trial aims to activate the first evolution, to initiate awareness. As for the evolution of currency, the support of Mony, it is in the natural order of things. People unwittingly encourage it, making it irresistible. However, it responds to a logic: on the one hand, people seek comfort and convenience; on the other, everything that is born evolves and must disappear. Mony, the belief that the concept of value is necessary for exchange, was born out of the necessity of barter. Once Mony is ingrained in minds, only its support evolves, and it is still evolving. With virtual currency units, this long evolution is coming to an end, a conclusion that will hasten the end of Mony itself. Soon, currency will have no substance; Mony, no body; the soul, no envelope. A breath could carry it all away, like the wind disperses smoke! However, let us have no doubt, sooner or later, a new storm will arise. Enlightened individuals, with the wind at their backs, will seize the opportunity to stand against the emaciated currency and deliver the final blow. Thus, the long and dismal existence of Mony will come to an end. How could it be otherwise? Why should Mony be the only thing to escape death? It will not escape, unless, to our misfortune, we exempt it. And even then! Even humans cannot oppose the force of the things they engender and that propel them forward simultaneously. Capitalo-liberalism is the ultimate stage of the monetary system, the last step that Man, in his tireless quest for JUSTICE, can reach under the domination of Mony. But history will not stop there. The force of things urges Man to take one more step, the step that will crush Mony and bring forth Equality. In fact, the triumphant cries of capitalo-liberalism still mask the tolling bell for Mony in our ears. But the day of reflection has come, and the day of Equality is closer than we think!

Fellow citizens, Mony exists only through the false idea we have of it, through the acceptance of some and the resignation of others. People still persist in

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

confusing it with currency. But who does not realize that currency itself is nothing, that value (market value) is but an abstraction, an abstraction devoid of social significance, an abstraction that only physical currency could impose on us as an obvious and indispensable concept. People have bank accounts, but what is an account, where is it, what does it contain? Nothing! Yet, the idea of a bank account is still as solid as a safe. People are still slaves to Mony... but where are their chains? When exchanges were made in tangible coins, the chains were tangible, albeit just as absurd! Now that they consist of electronic transfers, manipulation of air currents, people are only prisoners of their lack of imagination and courage. Financial constraints are still invoked, but they are pure fiction. And it is in the name of this fiction that some are poorly paid and deprived of their Rights while others, rich in wind, monopolize them. The day will come when workers will seriously question why some are rich, others poor when they share the commonality of Work, and only a nonexistent parameter separates them!

Mrs. Shortsighted : Mr. Accuser, you haven't mentioned anything about underdeveloped countries, who are much worse off than we are! They should be our top priority!

Citizen, injustice is not measured between the poor of different countries but between the rich and poor within the same country. We cannot and should not be indifferent to the fact that, in some countries, people are dying of hunger and suffering atrocious ills. But how does that console us for being stripped of our Citizens' Rights by our own "Fellow Citizens"? Will accepting our morally unbearable state feed the hungry populations and heal their wounds? If we must not accept it, inevitably, we must do everything to change it, without being diverted from this goal. Do not confuse JUSTICE and humanity. Citizens must fight at home for JUSTICE, and people (from different countries) must help each other out of humanity. But what is the value of humanity in those who do not desire JUSTICE?

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Beware! The attitude you advocate eerily resembles that of arrogant colonizers who claimed that savage peoples were waiting for them like the messiah⁷⁴ and who, under the pretext of bringing them the lights of progress, exterminated them, subjected them to the yoke, destroyed their civilizations, imposed laws unsuitable for their customs, transmitted diseases to them, burdened them with debts, and so on. In truth, they have always had everything they need; the superfluous is of no use to them. Misery is often the result of our interference. In many cases, the best thing we should do is let them live as they see fit and focus on curing our own ills.

Citizen, charity begins at home! Let's sweep in front of our own door before giving lessons to others, even when they ask us for nothing. Do you believe that Mony is the best cement between Peoples? Besides its gilding, do you believe that our capitalist civilization today is so exemplary that it should be exported throughout the universe and that it would be less beneficial without the financial problems that plague it? A sick doctor is a poor healer! Certainly, Peoples owe each other solidarity and fraternity, just like Citizens of the same City⁷⁵; but solidarity is working together. You speak of "underdeveloped" countries as if Western or Westernized countries must spoon-feed them. They don't ask for that much. At best, let's offer them an example, let them take what they need from us, or give them what is genuinely beneficial—a progress for them. But let's stop trying to impose a way of life on them that they have no use for, to which they are not adapted, that shakes their social structures, and annihilates their energy. Let them develop at their own pace and go through the experiences, even tragic ones, from which they must learn lessons and which alone can strengthen them in the present and prepare them for the future. We can, to some extent, let them benefit from progress made here, but only if it does not prevent them from progressing on

74 Doesn't the term "underdeveloped" imply that the development achieved by Western countries is the absolute reference? It is evident that some countries are more or less developed than others, but speaking of underdevelopment is absurd. Each country has a level of development (from a technical, political, cultural perspective, etc.) corresponding to the period in its history. Thus, it would be absurd to say, for example, that France in the 10th century was underdeveloped, even though it was obviously less developed than today. At best, it is permissible to speak of underdevelopment in countries where progress does not benefit the entire population but only a minority. From this perspective, all countries are underdeveloped. It would also be necessary to distinguish between countries where progress is primarily their own achievement and those where it is largely imported because, in the latter case, the contrasts between their inhabitants are artificially accentuated.

75 Solidarity and fraternity among Peoples are not principles of the social order, as according to them, the City is constituted to protect its members against any external, or even internal, dangers. But as soon as the Cities are at peace, when they do not need to defend themselves, there is nothing to prevent them from helping each other. In fact, their eagerness to help each other (once harmony reigns within them) is the measure of their humanity.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

their own and does not turn them into eternal dependents⁷⁶. In short, perhaps provide them with the seed, teach them how to cultivate it, but do not force the tree or only its fruits upon them!

As for Mony, it is a poison for us; how could it be a remedy for them? Are you unaware that the fortunes intended for the people of these countries are actually used to build basilicas, enrich mafiosos, dictators, tyrants, etc., and ultimately plunge their countries into corruption and debt? Cooperation, the most fruitful and fraternal form of aid, exists under Mony: it would be the only one without it and would be much more developed. What could be achieved despite Mony could only be done better if it were gone! Do you think that the desire of people to help each other depends on its existence? However, is their ability to help each other also independent of Mony? And does this dependence on Mony not, in many cases, lead them to compromise their will?

Be sure, Citizen, that protecting Mony is a bad calculation if you truly want to help these countries. Also, know that one who wants to alleviate Humanity in their homeland wants happiness everywhere. But no one can make another person happy in their place, and the best way to love them is to consider them responsible, respect their freedom, and respect oneself.

Mr. Glutton: And nature? You seem to ignore, Mr. Accuser, the fact that Citizens, free to access the market, would consume and waste much more than today, so that all natural resources would not be enough to satisfy their appetite, and the impact of the City on the environment would be terrible. Capitalism causes havoc; the City would lead to catastrophe!

76 The first thing is to determine the period in their history to provide them, if they desire, with tailored education, a science that may seem backward to us but would constitute real progress for them. The progress made by Western countries is linked to their climate, history, culture, social structures, etc. Therefore, it is ridiculous to think that these countries with radically different conditions can, even with a lot of help, leap to the level of development of Western countries, which are adapted to them alone. Hence, if one truly wishes to help them, one must refrain from selling them equipment but teach them techniques (in all fields) that do not require the knowledge and technology or even the climate of Western countries, so they can implement them at home and spread them without our constant support. If, nonetheless, they wish to receive advanced education, schools should be established in their countries. It is essential to prevent their elites from seeking education in Western countries, whose way of life can only attract and detain them (thus depriving their home countries of their talents) or miss them when they return home, making them unhappy or desiring to reproduce the Western lifestyle. If, despite all, their elites are sent to us for training, it must be ensured that they return to their countries to deploy their energy, spread the acquired knowledge, be a driving force, and effectively advance their country.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

The City would lead to catastrophe, you say! But isn't the catastrophe already looming on the horizon when Equality is not present? Would the City be worse than capitalism from an ecological point of view? This is an unfounded assertion. But, assuming you are right, how to put an end to the ravages caused, by your own admission, by capitalism without leaving capitalism? Because, make no mistake: the ecological problems generated by capitalism, in other words, by Mony, will worsen, and the catastrophe you fear will occur, whether there is Equality or not! If, between two evils, one must choose the lesser, between the assured worst and the unknown, anything is better than the worst. It is therefore senseless on your part to diminish the consequences of capitalism, known to be catastrophic in the long term, and to exaggerate those of the City, of which, in truth, you know nothing, thus condemning our only escape.

Why fear, initially, the consequences of Equality, which could not be those of Mony, which are indeed fearsome, and attribute to Citizens the reflexes and attitudes of our contemporaries instead of asking why capitalism causes ecological havoc? Before knowing whether Citizens would waste or not, whether the City would pollute or not, let us examine the current reasons for waste and pollution.

We are in the era of what we call the consumer society. But the problem is not in the natural and legitimate act of individuals consuming; it is in the way of producing, in the reasons and way of consuming, discarding, and in the way of managing waste. If we knew how to produce without depleting natural resources or polluting, and if, downstream, we could treat all our waste, the scale of consumption and waste, no matter how large, would be of no consequence. But it does matter because everything is always connected, and today it is connected to Mony.

The first reason why people consume more out of desire than need today is their excessive attachment to goods, which is stimulated by inequality (thus Mony) that gives goods a social meaning. We have already explained this process, but it is important to recall it.

Money limits, moreover unevenly, the purchasing power of individuals, so they cannot consume freely, which creates frustration and a desire to satisfy it. The less they can have, the more they want to have, a desire they can

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

satisfy to some extent with time. It remains that, in inequality, the possessions of individuals reflect their social status, in other words, the financial category to which they belong, hence the social significance of goods. However, since it is insulting to belong to a lower financial category, individuals, unable to move up, seek, through the acquisition of certain goods, to appear socially higher than they actually are.

In addition to this, there is the fact that people, being naturally different, want to distinguish themselves from each other, and each, for the reasons we have just mentioned, believes they can achieve this by possessing goods that others do not, and preferably goods of "great" value to showcase and "make others envious" (It goes without saying that people can truly compete and generally only seek to compete with their surroundings, with people in the same financial category as them.) Those who are not up to par therefore feel a sense of inferiority, an unbearable feeling⁷⁷ that only the acquisition of fashionable, avant-garde, or extraordinary goods can alleviate, they believe. But buying only provides temporary relief, as others, for the same reasons, will also buy, and then it all starts again. Distinguishing oneself through possessions, through Having, is thus an illusion. Nevertheless, it is this illusion that encourages the race for consumption and waste, waste resulting in particular from the premature replacement of goods that could have served much longer.

Another reason of the same kind is the desire, for individuals in a high financial category (a consequence of Mony), to display their belonging to this category and to impose it on individuals in lower categories. Hence their purchases of sumptuous and practically useless goods, whose production or use often causes monstrous havoc or waste. For example, fur coats, villas on the coasts, and especially large vehicles, enormous yachts, and other private planes⁷⁸. That individuals can own these last goods for their sole pleasure, which consume extraordinary amounts of fuel, is scandalous for two reasons: the first is that, even if it is true that the masses pollute more than a tiny

⁷⁷ This feeling is all the more unbearable because it is not just an illusion, as "Citizens" are genuinely unequal in rights. Individuals belonging to a financial category will never be the equals, on any level, of those belonging to financial categories higher than theirs. Inequality condemns individuals to an inferiority against which they can do nothing except accept it. The sense of inferiority arising from differences in wealth among people of the same financial category is therefore even more unbearable as it reflects their real inferiority, and they accept it even less as it is a priori possible for them to make it disappear by purchasing.

⁷⁸ In another domain, we could talk about wealthy collectors for whose pleasure archaeological or historical sites are plundered and ravaged.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

minority, it is absurd that an individual can alone pollute as much as a multitude of others; the second is that fuel is a natural resource limited today, and natural resources are a common good to Humanity, at least to the "Society" from whose soil they are drawn. Paying does not legitimize polluting the environment or wasting a common good.

Thus, it is in the nature of a monetary system that people are materialistic. But they are much more so under capitalism. For in a system where every natural or legal person has as its main goal to make money or not to lose it, that of companies is to make a profit, to sell as much as possible, to satisfy their interests at the expense of the general interest if necessary. The latter must therefore encourage individuals to consume more than necessary by creating in them artificial and baseless needs, exacerbating their frustrations, in short, by dumbing them down. They succeed through advertising, often relayed by the media, which is their main source of income. Therefore, it is not difficult to understand why this system, endowed with formidable production capacity and devoid of any morality, having brought back the motto of bread and circuses, is the scene of a gigantic waste.

But, as we have said, the problem is not so much consumption, even if excessive, as the way of producing and treating waste. However, the same financial considerations prevail in these areas as well. Companies, seeking to produce as much as possible at the lowest cost, either partially or completely give up using the best materials (with all the dangers that implies), either to make their poor products available to modest consumers or to hasten their obsolescence and renewal; they resort to the cheapest techniques, which are often the most devastating and polluting, while the few jobs they provide engage local communities to turn a blind eye to the destruction and pollution generated. Moreover, they do not have the financial means to clean up the pollution linked to the activity of companies, no more than the means necessary to curb the pollution resulting from the waste of their population.

However, the lack of financial means is not the only obstacle, even if the other obstacles are also related to Money. It may be the case that people do not know how to produce without polluting or how to treat their waste better. This is then a question of science. But is it enough that new and ecological techniques be found or known for them to be adopted? No! Because they

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

often contradict powerful interests. It can indeed be the interests of the companies directly concerned, which, instead of investing enormous capital to convert their production apparatus, prefer to continue producing as they have always done and to ignore the consequences. Furthermore, a company that changes its production method, that adopts new manufacturing materials, etc., changes suppliers. If the novelty proves itself and all companies of the same kind adopt it, the suppliers in question die. Their vital interest is therefore to oppose progress, to control science, to hinder research, to deceive public opinion, and, when they cannot prevent discoveries, to buy patents to bury them or use them later, but too late, for their profit. In general, powerful financial interests (lobbyists) are linked to each economic activity. Anything that threatens them, they buy or crush. They stop at nothing to achieve their ends. They are willing to sacrifice Humanity, in the name of Mony, to safeguard their profits. From this point of view, their greatest trick is to have consumers, whom they despise, defend their interests, which they achieve by passing on to them the cost (financial or social) of progress.

But, citizen, we cannot neglect in this matter the consequences of the inequality in rights among the "Citizens." The poor, being the majority, are in mass the main polluters (after companies) but are individually responsible for only a tiny part of the pollution. Why, then, would a poor person feel concerned about environmental problems? A change in behavior on their part in their way of consuming has no impact. Why would they want to change their way of consuming when, on the one hand, they see that others consume and pollute much more than them, when, on the other hand, they envy those who, no matter what they do, will continue to feast? Moreover, how could they change it when they can hardly consume less, when they do not have the means to consume differently, when they can only buy what companies produce (usually legally) and when the law often prohibits the use of the most ecological products? We must therefore question how human laws are formed under Mony (humans being necessarily subject to those dictated by Mony itself). According to the Principles, a law is the expression of the general will, that is, of the People. But, in inequality, it is above all the expression of the interests of the powerful, the rich, the lobbies. Democracy cannot be, and representative democracy—more precisely the representative system—is just a trap for fools. Because even when the elected officials do

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

not belong to privileged castes or are not their puppets, the interest of the People largely coincides with that of the powerful, since, the law being "equal" for all, what is financially good for the latter is often also good for the former, albeit to a lesser extent, and what is good for all or wise in the absolute always results in policies that he is the first to pay for⁷⁹. Thus the true interests of the People are never defended, whether the law (dictated by the elected officials) takes them into account or whether they are ignored by the People themselves. Thus those who pollute the most, those who are responsible for pollution and who can best protect themselves from its effects, in short, the rich, are also those who make the laws or influence them the most. Thus, in a monetary world, everything conspires against nature; there remains, to fight for the environment, only incantations and appeals to the civic sense of individuals, derisory and illusory weapons against Mony.

Such are, in broad strokes, the root causes of pollution and ecological damage caused by capitalism, and the reasons why Mony is its mastermind. It is as impossible to absolve the latter as it is futile to hope to rectify the situation significantly as long as it reigns. The only appropriate response to these problems and to all our problems is therefore Equality, as it is the only antibody capable of neutralizing and producing, in all areas simultaneously, effects opposite to those of inequality⁸⁰. Environmentalists must not make the mistake in their field that every specialist makes in theirs, the mistake of believing that the problem they deal with can be solved with billions, since even assuming it is possible to devote all financial resources to solving a

79 When the emissions of carbon dioxide from automobiles began to concern the authorities, there was talk of requiring manufacturers to install catalytic converters. The measure was buried due to the additional cost it would have represented for consumers. Conversely, techniques that would allow for less fuel consumption and, therefore, less pollution are prohibited due to the loss of revenue for the State, which taxes fuels at 80%.

80 In "How the Rich Are Destroying the Planet," Hervé Kempf, after condemning various inequalities as the root causes of ecological problems, suggests adopting the motto: "Liberty, ecology, fraternity" (Editions du Seuil, January 2007, Paris, p. 116). He thus substitutes ecology for Equality. In other words, he sees no other remedy for ecological problems generated by inequalities than ecology itself, while evidently only Equality can annihilate inequalities and consequently solve ecological problems. Such a proposal reveals on its own that Mr. Kempf is far from denouncing Mony, of which he is ignorant, and that he also lacks an understanding of what Equality is. A telling sentence in this regard is: "There is no necessary link between poverty and inequality" (ibid, p. 48). Therefore, it is not surprising that Mr. Kempf, who positions himself as a critic of capitulo-liberalism, proposes a range of capitalist measures as solutions. It is worth noting the sentence that precedes the aforementioned motto: "To face it [the looming chaos], you must know the goal: achieve a sober society; chart the course: achieve this transformation with fairness, by first placing the burden on those who are the most endowed..." Does wanting to achieve a sober society not imply knowing what a society is and not ignoring that we are not in a society today? Does wanting to base the transformation of society on fairness not ignore that fairness, by definition arbitrary, is precisely the principle on which capitalism rests (since the assumption of monetary exchange is that a sum of money is of equivalent value to what it allows one to acquire, in other words, that the exchange of labor or goods/money is always just and fair)? Finally, does wanting to place the burden on those who are the most endowed not amount to saying that the rich must pay, in other words, engaging in financial jugglery instead of tackling Mony itself?

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

problem, this would not only not solve it but would also worsen the situation in all other areas. In other words, they must not forget in turn that everything is linked. Environmental problems do not make "Society" sick; it is the fact that "Society" is sick that generates them. It is therefore "Society" itself that must be treated... by administering its natural Principles to it.

To begin with, in Equality, the City would, by force of circumstance, be a true Democracy; laws would truly be the expression of the will of the People. Because, for the same reasons that laws are today the direct or indirect work of those who benefit the most from inequality, Citizens equal in Rights would have, directly or indirectly, the same influence on them and would influence them in the direction of the general interest. Certainly, we have said above that the People are ignorant of their own interests. We implied then that Mony hides them from them or forbids them from taking them into account because their true interests are in contradiction with their financial interests, in other words, with their rights that take precedence over everything. But Citizens no longer fearing for their Rights would only lend an ear to common sense. Now, if environmental problems concern us when we hardly have the means to remedy them, there is no reason to think that the City, which would have unsuspected means to solve them, would no longer care about them! On the contrary, everything leads to believe that it would care about them as much if not more than we do.

Companies and Citizens would have a theoretically unlimited purchasing power. (Research, no longer hindered by budget constraints, would be more efficient than ever.) The law could therefore subject them to stricter standards and impose on them to adopt the most ecological techniques without costing them anything, without it having any impact on the Rights of their employees or those of consumers. Why, in these conditions, would they hesitate? How could they even escape the will of the City, mistress of their existence, and that of local authorities who would no longer need the financial resources they provide today and would only be concerned with the health of their population? In fact, everyone holding their Rights directly from the City, no one being able to give Rights or increase their own at the expense of others, companies, today powerful and influential thanks to the money they give or withdraw, would have no means of pressure on local authorities, on Citizens,

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

on elected officials, on research, on the media, etc. In truth, the pressure would be exerted in the opposite direction, a moral pressure, pressure in the common interest.

Take the example of fishermen, now wrongly or rightly accused of overfishing and depleting the sea of its fish, or at least jeopardizing certain species. The problem here is not whether these accusations are justified or not. The problem is that the rights of fishermen depend on their sales, thus on the volume of their catch and market prices. In this context, it is legitimate for them to contest the reductions in quotas imposed on them, even if it is evident that they care neither about the consumer nor the public interest but only about their private interest, the preservation of their profits. But what could fishermen oppose to a reduction in quotas (up to a temporary ban on fishing for a particular species) that would have no impact on their Rights as Citizens, in other words, on their employment and purchasing power? Whatever the fears of environmentalists, justified or not, they would comply. It would then be possible to calmly address the substantive debate, with no one being suspected of bad faith⁸¹.

In conclusion, in an Equal society, the City would have the will and the means to produce with the greatest possible respect for the environment. But it would also have, for the same reasons, the means to significantly develop recycling, to the point of being able to recycle everything. Respect for the environment upstream of consumption, respect for the environment downstream – there would therefore only be the question of consumption itself, which would no longer represent a problem in itself.

You express concern, citizen, about the high purchasing power that Citizens would have, the rampant consumption, and the monumental waste that could

81 From this perspective, we can also discuss the issue of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs). The essence of the debate is whether they pose a potential danger to consumer health and the environment. However, the debate does not truly revolve around this aspect. Today, financial considerations prevail. It is important to note that genetically modified plant species do not reproduce, and farmers who use them are therefore obliged to purchase seeds from the companies that produce them every year. The interests of farmers and those of the companies are thus opposed for the same reason: money. The position of these companies allows them, or will eventually allow them, to set the prices they want, increasingly higher prices, and thus amass fortunes at the expense of farmers. This prospect, of course, can only scare the farmers. Needless to say, the financial interests at stake drive companies to take certain actions, and farmers do everything to resist the pressure, with the actions of both parties distorting or diverting the debate. But suppose that companies are, as they should be, in the service of the City, and that access to the market is, for Citizens as well as companies, a matter of Right. The companies producing GMOs—if there are still any—would supply the City on which they would depend. They would do so not for profit, but out of Duty, and it would cost farmers nothing to obtain their seeds from the market every year. The debate could then be brought back to its true focus: ecology and public health.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

result. In reality, Citizens would not consume more, but better, and perhaps even less (in the long run). The difference today between a rich person and a poor person lies less in the quantity than in the quality of what they buy. Poor people also eat, dress, have cell phones, cars, etc. However, whether products are of good or bad quality, the quantity of material needed to manufacture them is roughly the same. On the other hand, low-quality products wear out more quickly, thus are replaced more frequently. In the end, it is preferable in terms of natural resources (when recycling is poorly organized) for Citizens to acquire quality products, which they would undoubtedly do⁸². That being said, goods would no longer have social significance. Citizens would no longer acquire things to show off. Moreover, they would no longer have material frustrations to satisfy; they would no longer need to have in order to be. It is also likely that the "rental" of certain goods (cars, bicycles, etc.) would develop considerably at the expense of ownership. All these factors would probably stagnate or even decrease the level of consumption of goods, which, in any case, would be recyclable, recycled, and non-polluting as much as possible.

Furthermore, the true increase in Citizens' consumption would not be in goods but in services, which, from an ecological point of view, pose little problem. It is indeed in this area that Supply and Demand would explode. You can therefore be fully reassured, citizen.

⁸² It is preferable, for example, that Citizens consume "organic" and/or local food products, often better but more expensive today, than industrial products and/or those coming from the other side of the world, cheaper, often less good (both in terms of taste and health) and indirectly more polluting (production methods, transport, etc.). There is no doubt that Citizens, able to choose freely between the two, would opt for quality, which would stimulate traditional and local agriculture and livestock.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mr Neuron: Nevertheless, Mr. Accuser, in the era of globalization, it is impossible to overthrow Mony. Countries are too economically interdependent for any one of them to unilaterally abandon currency.

Why, citizen, don't you openly state your true thoughts? You implicitly use an impossibility as a pretext to conclude, under the guise of apparent logic, that it is impossible to overthrow Mony. You seem to believe that it would be impossible for a non-monetary country to trade with the remaining monetary countries, that this country would be cut off from the world. In reality, sensing, rightly so, how necessary international exchanges are, you conclude, not that it is fundamentally impossible for a country to overthrow Mony, but that this country should not touch it to continue importing. Therefore, since this holds true for all countries, Mony must be preserved everywhere, and we must continue to deal with it. You would arrive at the same conclusion by reasoning differently, arguing that Mony can only be overthrown somewhere if it is overthrown everywhere simultaneously, which is indeed impossible⁸³, forcing each country to refrain forever.

Well, citizen, all these arguments are without any impact. Only one thing is true: the economic interdependence between countries, peoples, and individuals. However, we don't need to explain here how a City that has eradicated Mony within itself could continue to exchange with other countries. You can, however, reflect on this: 1) There is no reason why a social body purged of Mony could not evolve just as well in a monetary world as an individual with a physical body immersed in a monetary "Society"; 2) Since countries are interdependent, a City would need to exchange with other countries just as much as they would need to exchange with it. The question, therefore, would arise not only from the City's perspective but also from the perspective of monetary countries. In other words, the interest in finding a

83 It is impossible to annihilate Money worldwide in one stroke, and this for three simple reasons: first, not all countries can have this will any more than another at the same time; second, the end of Money is a matter of evolution (technical, economic, political, etc.), and not all countries evolve and have evolved at the same pace, so the material conditions to switch from currency to another means of exchange are not everywhere met; third, a consequence of the second, is that the countries ready to take the plunge will neither want nor be able to wait for the others to be equally resolved.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

solution would be shared by all, and therefore, a solution would undoubtedly be found.

There is, therefore, no need to worry about the City. The problem you raised, citizen, would indeed arise, but it would not be insoluble. In short, your off-topic reflection and concerns are baseless, and if we doubted your good faith, we could accuse you of wanting to save Mony, not by defending it, but by distracting us. So, don't ask yourself so many questions and avoid considering Mony in relation to anything other than Society. Especially since, as we have pointed out, all your assumptions are false.

Talking about globalization is very fashionable today, but this term gives a false image of the world. It makes us believe, under the pretext that production and trade are conducted on a global scale (which is not really new), that borders have been pushed so far away from countries that they no longer exist, that all countries on the globe form a whole. Nothing could be further from the truth. Borders have not moved away from countries; they have, on the contrary, come closer to individuals. They have not fallen; they have multiplied. Capitalo-liberalism has thus completed the dissolution of Societies, annihilated the old solidarities that still existed, and delivered everyone to themselves. Globalization is not a planetary Society, but the total absence of Society; it is not a universal homeland, but the reign of each for themselves; it is not the triumph of Man, but that of Mony; it is not the formation of a whole, but the emergence of nothingness. It follows that it is impossible, from this nothingness, to constitute a planetary Society⁸⁴, as people are unaware of what a Society is exactly, and therefore, to eventually achieve a true global social order, the Principles of the social order must be rediscovered and implemented somewhere so that, by this example, they can spread everywhere, at least wherever they can take root.

On the contrary, a People transitioning from currency to another means of exchange, a People genuinely forming a Society, thus moving from inequality to Equality, from the concentration of individuals to the association of Citizens, would not take a backward step but would show all humans how to unite and move forward in the direction of the unity of mankind. It must be said and emphasized, as Mony so confuses minds, so inversely distorts

⁸⁴ The same reasons make it impossible, under the dominance of Money, to establish a true Europe, a European Society, a social and democratic Europe.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

things, that people are systematically deceived by appearances and media manipulations. Believing that globalization and globalism are a step towards unity, when their goal is to establish the reign of the powerful (servants of Mony) over the division of people and the ruins of nations, they are very likely to denounce anything tending towards the formation of Societies worthy of the name as a retreat, as a reactionary or nationalist will⁸⁵.

This brings us to your assertion that an isolated country could not abandon currency. Not only have we seen that a developed country could do so, as the absence of currency within would not prevent it from trading externally, but we now add that a country in a position to do so should. Because the opportunity to eradicate Mony, which will be the result of very particular conditions, will not present itself to all countries at the same time. The first to whom it presents itself, that is, the first People who have the capacity and the will to do so, will have no choice but to seize it. Circumstances will have brought it to a point in its history where it will be no more possible for it to retreat from its destiny than to wait for others to be ready themselves. On one side, capitalism will have finally put it in an untenable position, and on the other, all current obstacles will be smoothed out. It can easily do what it does not even dare to imagine today.

Finally, some may object that neighboring countries will not let it happen. However, they must be able to prevent it. The decision to overthrow Mony will only be made by a country when people have no other choice, the day when capitalism collapses on its own, which, in the era of globalization, will happen everywhere at the same time. Each country, especially in the West, will then be grappling with its own difficulties and incapable of intervening in the affairs of another⁸⁶. In fact, Western countries that are roughly at the same level of development and will be in the same desperate situation will all be seeking solutions and curious to know the outcome of the revolutionary experiment led by the pioneer.

85 Some already denounce "sovereignism" as if there could exist a more democratic, progressive, and legitimate "social order" than the one based on the sovereignty of the People, as if Peoples, already deprived of their sovereignty by their so-called national representatives, could have any influence on decisions made by who knows who, for who knows what reason, within supranational institutions! Despite everything, it is at the level of nations, as they exist today and have for centuries, that Peoples can hope to one day have the opportunity to take control of their destinies and crush Money and its minions who plot in the shadows to enslave them.

86 It is often said that from evil can emerge good. The simultaneous paralysis of all countries and the possibility that it will result in a solitary country delivering the coup de grâce to Money without fear, serving as an example to the world, may be the good, the only good, but the great good that will come out of globalization.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Citizen jurors, it will always be possible to say that we have told nonsense, but it will be impossible to support this by reason and in writing unless one wants to offer a concert of false notes. It is true that if people are deaf, it will not bother them.

Thus, Mony kills Society. We have witnessed the demise, and a more in-depth autopsy of this decomposing corpse would not change this observation. We have said a lot for those who are thirsty, but we would never say enough for those who do not want to drink. So, there is no need to provoke resistance with passionate insistence! There are truths that only people can convince themselves of, and victories that only time can bring. The time has come for us to conclude.

History has taught us that people cannot judge, let alone condemn Mony if they do not know exactly what a Society is or should be. They will remain ignorant as long as they fail to break free from Mony, that is, from the belief that the concept of (market) value is necessary for exchange. How could they prejudge something necessary, even indispensable, and deem it condemnable at the same time? It's not possible. Consequently, Mony, which they do not consider for a moment, is an integral part of their conception of "Society," even though it is manifestly antisocial. The loop is closed.

It was therefore impossible to denounce Mony without giving a glimpse of a world where it would not reign, just as it is impossible to distinguish the quality or defect of an object without ever comparing it to others. Therefore, we have established Equality as the fundamental principle of social order.

But why choose to oppose Equality to Mony? Simply because the reign of Mony is, on the contrary, the reign of inequality. How can one realize the presence of Mony and measure its role, understand that it is the source of inequality, and that inequalities are linked to it if one reasons about "Society" not only by paying no attention to it but also by integrating its effects as untouchable parameters, instead of conceiving a social order based on Equality, from which it would obviously be banned? Moreover, we are not the first to see Equality as the fundamental principle of Society. This principle has been proclaimed for more than two centuries already. It is enshrined in our Constitution and even in the motto of our Republic. It is true that its trace would be sought in vain in reality, and that, on our part, we give it a more

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

extended meaning. But is it a coincidence that Equality is not present when Mony is everything? Is it a coincidence that, despite their intuition, our elders, prisoners of Mony, conceived an Equality that turns out to be without significance? They proclaimed the equality of "Citizens" before the law. Very well! They declared "Citizens" equal in rights. Even better! However, unwilling and unable to touch Mony, they left to currency the dominion over the fundamental right for every Citizen to enjoy the benefits of the City and only recognized equality for secondary rights that, therefore, are often illusory or without interest.

We had to refer to another conception of Equality. As your opinion on Mony will derive from your opinion on this conception of Equality, we must recall it.

According to us, Equality is the fundamental Principle of Law and social order. This implies that all Citizens have the same Duties (fundamental) towards the City and must enjoy the same Rights (fundamental and indirect) in return. In other words, Citizenship defines both the Duties and Rights of a Citizen, so that Duties and Rights cannot vary from one Citizen to another, especially since the Duties fulfilled by some generate or guarantee the Rights of others. Originally, the first Duty of a Citizen was to defend his Fellow Citizens and the City, as men were grouped for security reasons. Security was, therefore, the first Right of the Citizen. But the understanding of Duties and Rights expands as the capacities of the Society grow. Today, the first Duty of the Citizen is to participate in the life of the City, according to what the City considers as participation. Consequently, the first Right for a Citizen, for an individual whose participation has been recognized, is to be able to enjoy all the benefits of the City. These benefits, being the result of the participation of Citizens, manifest themselves notably in the form of products, services, etc. Enjoying the benefits of the City being a Citizen's Right, it is due to their Citizenship that Citizens have the Right to access these products, services, in short, to the market. For Citizens to exercise this Right, it is sufficient that their Citizenship be known or attested by merchants, service providers, etc. When a City is composed of a small number of members, everyone knows each other naturally. But when Citizens are numerous and unknown to each other, the City must provide them with a means to have their Citizenship recognized everywhere and at all times. This means is, in fact, a means of

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

exchange since, on the one hand, it is the means for Citizens to acquire goods and benefit from services in exchange for their participation in the life of the City, and, on the other hand, it allows Citizens to mutually benefit from their work, even if there is no direct exchange between them. Needless to say, this means conveys not only a conception of exchange but also the conception of Society and social relations that generated it, and thus, beyond men, it becomes the guarantor of Equality. Such a means is necessary to constitute a City in modern times and even indispensable for Equality to be unshakeable.

We have emphasized the Right to access the market, which stems from the fundamental Right for a Citizen to benefit from the blessings of his City because, as the monetary system proves, it conditions all other Rights. Citizens cannot be equal in Rights if they are unequal in this Right.

This is what we can say in a few words about Equality as we conceive it, as we have explained throughout this trial. It is evident that for us, it is everything that is just, that it arises from an implacable social logic, and that anyone who disputes it de facto denies that Citizens should be equal and that individuals who participate in the life of what is now "Society" are potential Citizens. Now, we cannot force anyone to adhere to it, but let no one reject it while positioning themselves as the champion of Equality, social justice, humanity, freedom, generosity, or any other grand idea. Experience shows that the slightest reluctance towards it leads to or rests on a concession to Mony, and the slightest concession to Mony ensures total impunity for the latter. Here, there is no middle ground. Mony and currency cannot disappear partially, no more than Equality can exist partially. Society cannot rest on several logics at the same time or simultaneously implement different Principles in the same domain. And what a difference!

The belief that the notion of market value is necessary for exchange, Mony, originated from the practice of barter, in times when it was impossible to exchange in any other way. Indeed, the impossibility of exchanging otherwise has persisted until today, always preventing people from considering (at least realistically) another mode of exchange than direct barter or indirect barter via money, and thus feeling trapped by Mony, let alone denouncing it. However, what matters to us here is not whether it is finally possible to adopt a new

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

mode of exchange but whether the one in force today, which owes everything to Mony, is guilty from the perspective of Society.

First of all, let us note that it is neither by chance nor by a whim that we say that Mony must be judged, first and foremost, in relation to Society. Mony is the *raison d'être* of currency and the foundation of the monetary system. Currency, as a means of exchange, is the link between all individuals participating in the system, between all individuals presumed to be Citizens. Being at the center of social relations, and even social conflicts, it inevitably plays a prominent "social" role. In fact, no one will contest that our "Societies" revolve around it. Money is, therefore, the lifeblood of the social body, and Mony, its spirit. This implies that all actions of individuals and "Society" are conducted by Mony or carried out with the underlying thought that the notion of market value is necessary for exchange, that things must have a price, that money is indispensable, etc. We would have arrived at this conclusion more quickly if, instead of saying "Society," we had talked about the monetary system or capitalism, which would have left less room for ambiguity. Because the first consequence of Mony is precisely to annihilate Society.

Indeed, the notion of market value only exists if things are exchanged between each other, if individuals exchange between themselves (directly or indirectly through a value standard) and own their production. A Society that endorses such a mode of exchange feels in no way concerned by exchanges, thus by the protagonists of exchanges, namely its own Citizens, who, moreover, expect nothing from it. In fact, such a "Society" sees in its "Citizens" nothing more than individuals, individuals it abandons to themselves and lets tear each other apart. Some will say that this does not prevent a Society from recognizing its Citizens. But what can it recognize them for if it is unaware that exchanges—everything that allows them and everything that results from them—are the most important things in a Society and in the lives of Citizens, especially when the specialization of producers and their interdependence are at their peak; if it is unaware that exchanging implies producing and that producing, being a form of participation in the life of the City, is a Duty towards it; if, moreover, it is unaware that a Citizen must enjoy its benefits and that these benefits are precisely the object of exchanges in which, according to this mode of exchange, Citizenship does

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

not come into play; if, therefore, it is unaware of the basic Duties and Rights of the Citizen? It can certainly recognize rights for individuals, legitimate or arbitrary rights, in any case, secondary, and award them the title of Citizen, but Citizenship is, in fact, emptied of its substance. If there are no true Citizens, there is no true Society.

The other direct consequence of this mode of exchange is that nothing is more important than establishing an equivalence of value between things. Individuals themselves disappear behind the objects of exchange. Under these conditions, it is understandable that equality in rights among Citizens is the least concern of "Society." It would be impossible for it to establish it since it is already impossible for it to conceive it (with relevance), being unable to reason simultaneously according to two conceptions of equality, between objects and between Citizens. All that "Society" can do in these circumstances is play with words, lie to itself, and hope to deceive people.

It follows from what we have just said that a mode of exchange based on the belief that the notion of market value is necessary is by nature incompatible with Equality (of Citizens in Rights and Duties) and inevitably generates an unequal order of things, first by the simple play of values, then due to the flaws of money.

Once the right of individuals to participate in exchanges (to access the market) depends not on the fact that they produce but on the nature of their production, not on the interest or utility that their action has for Society but on the value that their production has in exchanges, not everyone can equally benefit from the system. Each can only then derive from exchanges a quantity of goods or services equivalent in value to that of their own production or efforts. However, the value of products is purely arbitrary, whether set by the powerful or through bargaining; it is in no way related to the recognition owed to producers by Society; it can vary from moment to moment and varies from one individual to another, from one type of activity to another. Thus, a system based on the notion of market value, which only makes sense if things have different values, inevitably leads to inequality in rights among "Citizens."

Money perpetuates this consequence of market value and aggravates it. In theory, the value of productions, and thus that of producers, is measured by

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

money. The (so-called) value of products is their price. The income of a producer, minus production costs and other expenses, minus the cost of unsold goods, constitutes their revenue, that is, their right to access the market in turn. This theory is true for independent producers. However, in practice, producers are usually businesses. The wages of employees, therefore, depend less on the price at which the products they collectively manufacture within their businesses are sold than on the policies of the company for which they work. Profits could be equally shared among employees, but two things prevent this: first, the persistent belief, often shared by the employees themselves, that different jobs have different values and deserve differentiated remuneration; second, money, by materializing the vital right to access the market, a right through which most rights effectively pass, places employees in great dependence on the one who pays them, in this case, the company or the employer, who therefore has the power and, a priori, an interest in paying them as little as possible. Employees are thus paid differently and unequal in rights. But even assuming that it is possible to pay employees equally within the same company, i.e., to distribute its profits equally among them, there would still be inequality among employees of different companies in the "City," thus among "Citizens," since all companies do not make the same profits. Money, therefore, applies, so to speak, a second layer of inequalities on "Society," so that people who often only scratch the surface, sometimes flake off or rather try to flake off the apparent layer, never manage to detect the deep-seated cause of inequality.

Some will argue that, to establish equality, it would be sufficient for the State to allocate an equal salary to all citizens, modifying the functioning of currency if necessary. Besides practical reasons that would make such equalization of salaries extremely complex and ultimately impossible to achieve, two logical reasons are enough to demonstrate the absurdity of such a project. Firstly, the concept of market value arises from the "free" exchange between individuals and only makes sense if things have different values. Therefore, currency itself only has a reason to exist if there is free exchange and a difference in value between jobs, which inevitably results in inequalities in wealth and rights. Standardizing incomes would, therefore, mean keeping currency while removing its reason for being. There is no need to say more to

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

understand that such a paradox would quickly bring any such experiment to an end, no matter how legitimate it may be.

Secondly, such a project is based on the observation that the right to access the market is essential for a citizen, the intuition that this right depends on wealth or income, hence on currency, and the conviction that citizens must be equal in rights, in short, on the will to ensure an equal right of access to the market for all citizens. However, wanting to artificially ensure an equal income for all citizens so that they can enjoy an equal right of access to the market is unconsciously recognizing that this right is an attribute of citizenship, in other words, that this right must be conferred by citizenship itself, not by currency. But in a monetary system, the right to access the market is naturally conferred by currency. This creates a new fatal paradox, and all the financial juggling that such a project presupposes serves only to hide it from the eyes of its promoters who do not realize that their principles condemn the currency they insist on retaining. These glaring paradoxes⁸⁷ have a single cause: Mony. As long as people cannot rid themselves of the belief that the concept of market value is necessary for exchange, it will seem natural and indispensable to them that things have a price, that there is therefore currency or at least a standard of value, and that "Citizens" have monetary units to access the market. The monetary system instills this belief, even makes it a prejudice, and this prejudice prevents people from conceiving any other exchange system than the monetary system. This is the first and greatest crime of Mony, from which all others stem. Its crime is not to take away people's freedom to think about it, to hold them mentally captive, but to

87 The paradoxes mentioned are not the only ones. Individuals who seriously consider equalizing incomes also argue that money is only a misused tool but refuse to discard this tool to put an end to its misuse. They speak of misuse, but they know that its normal, "natural" functioning is catastrophic, meaning that the problem comes from money itself, as they want to counter its operation or modify its nature. They want to establish a new order of things by driving out the natural, but they forget that it is in the nature of things for artifices to be ephemeral. Such projects are not only based on fatal paradoxes but also on gross errors. Firstly, salary or income equality has nothing to do with Equality in Rights because, on one hand, Rights conferred and limited by money, leveled by the State afterward, have nothing to do with a Right of access to the market conferred by Citizenship and, by definition, unlimited (at least in theory). On the other hand, an egalitarian situation desired by humans and based on laws against nature has nothing to do with Equality generated by a means of exchange (other than money) and maintained by the force of circumstances. Moreover, retaining money while equalizing salaries or incomes amounts to truncating the monetary logic without going to the end of the logic of Equality, thus undermining, on the one hand, the dynamism of capitalism and sabotaging, on the other hand, the mechanisms of Equality. In short, income equalization retains many drawbacks of capitalism (money, mentalities, etc.) and provides none of the benefits of Equality, so that new problems would arise, adding to the old ones and making one regret the normal capitalist regime, i.e., capitalo-liberalism.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

condemn them to live in the monetary hell, without even being able to see that money is the instrument of their misfortunes, even though they know it does not bring happiness. Mony is not criminal and tyrannical as a belief, but because of its tragic consequences.

However, the greatest tragedies result from the general unawareness surrounding money. Men who, despite everything, seek to understand the cause of their misfortunes and to avert them, automatically absolve money, especially Mony, and end up attributing all responsibility to themselves, either to individual shortcomings, certain behaviors, or a lack of collective will. Consequently, they consider solutions such as a change in individual behavior based on philosophy, spirituality, ecology, etc., which, as long as it does not fall into fanaticism, does no harm but is generally ineffective. Alternatively, they may seek retaliation against the beneficiaries of inequality, which may temporarily satisfy resentments but does not generate equality. Another approach involves adopting laws or systems aimed at equality, or even egalitarianism, which imply the proscription, compression, or annihilation of current beneficiaries, and may result in the best case in capitalo-liberalism or, in the worst case, communism. All these solutions make men the problem, and the last two more or less openly advocate violence as a remedy.

However, great tragedies are only the culmination of the daily tragedy of which money is the linchpin. Money is a consequence of Mony, so all direct and indirect effects of money themselves have Mony as their origin. This reminder is useful because the focus will now be solely on money, and one should not believe that, just because Mony is not mentioned, money alone should bear the blame for facts for which it is responsible only as an instrument.

The initial effects of money are linked, on the one hand, to the fact that as a medium of exchange, it is indispensable or at least allows access to everything⁸⁸, and on the other hand, to the fact that it materializes and alone confers the right to access the market. In other words, money transforms rights, obviously coveted, into tangible and valid things in every hand.

⁸⁸ Money always allows access to almost everything, but it is truly essential only when the specialization of individuals as producers is extreme. The problem is not that money, as a means of exchange, is essential, but that this essential means of exchange, money, violates all Principles and is susceptible to all abuses.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONEY

Therefore, money allows theft and prompts some to steal, which naturally exposes everyone to thieves and generates feelings of mistrust and insecurity among all. It should also be added that, due to the fact that money is a standard of value, everything that has value potentially represents money. Therefore, theft and other criminal practices do not only concern money but everything that represents it and can indirectly provide it. Money thus establishes an environment in which men fear not only for their money but also for their belongings and even for their person. Here are some joys to which it exposes them: fraud, burglary, blackmail, assault, extortion, kidnapping, slavery, prostitution, murder, etc.

But the theft of money, i.e., obtaining another's monetary units by force or trickery, is only an illegal way to exploit a property of money, namely its circulation, destined to be exchanged. Because the fact that money circulates, while it embodies the right to access the market, means that this right is not tied to the citizenship of the one who possesses and exercises it. It is this disconnection, in addition to the fact that money is by nature destined to pass from hand to hand, that makes theft not only possible but useful. Without it, no one could enjoy or exercise rights other than their legitimate ones. This also means that the legitimacy of the right to access the market lies not in the actions of individuals but solely in money. Thus, if all monetary units of a country were to suddenly disappear, no one would have any rights anymore. People would not be able to access their own production, and if they were foolish enough to believe themselves truly enslaved, they would perish from hunger rather than exercise the legitimate right that money embodies today.

The first consequence of the circulation of money is that everyone holds their rights from others, more precisely from the money they snatch before being forced to surrender it in turn. Therefore, it is not surprising that men are constantly in conflict over this volatile but vital element for all, which everyone desires to possess in the greatest possible quantity. In these conditions, how can harmony reign among them? Social peace will be nothing more than an empty dream as long as money is retained, which, by nature, pits men against each other and inspires petty sentiments.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Note also that if individuals have rights at the expense of others, it is also in the logic of money that "Citizens" strip themselves of their right of access as they exercise it, as they consume, so that the poorest among them quickly exhaust their rights and remain more or less long without rights. The monetary system thus accustoms people to label as "Citizens" both individuals who benefit very little from the benefits of "Society" and those who are the only ones to benefit. It distorts the notions of Citizenship and Rights so much that no one dares to see in money the incarnation of a fundamental right that should be equal for all citizens, equality incompatible with money and which, to be established, would condemn the latter to disappear.

But men, caught in the storm, have many other concerns: finding and keeping a job (therefore submitting to the demands of companies) to regularly earn what they constantly lose, pay, choose, sacrifice, bargain, save, borrow, repay, increase their income, etc. In fact, everything in their lives is more or less consciously, more or less directly, related to financial considerations, to their wallet, to their person. The monetary system constantly creates problems for them that they must bear alone, as it is up to individuals to obtain money on their own. They are therefore individualistic by force of circumstance, especially since the few times they are called to civic duty or reminded of their supposed "Citizenship" is to pay (taxes, for example) or earn nothing (while making money is the leitmotif of their actions).

On another scale, monetary circulation forces companies and states (which endorse money) to have the same kind of concerns, although it is always individuals who actually bear the brunt of their policies⁸⁹. It is impossible to list here all the dramatic consequences, visible and invisible, of the famous financial constraints, at any level (political, economic, ecological, national, international, professional, familial, individual, physical, moral), so long is their list. But it is no accident that almost all the facts reported by the media illustrate this observation, although none think to blame money.

Finally, it is inevitable that monetary circulation generates congestion. In other words, money cannot constantly circulate everywhere without eventually

⁸⁹ It is so true that individuals are always victims of corporate policies that it is often when companies record record profits that they decide to lay off part of their staff.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

concentrating somewhere. Now, the concentration of money means the concentration of rights, therefore power, the power to capture more money. It is therefore natural that money generates inequality in rights and that inequality in rights allows those who benefit from it to further accentuate inequalities to their advantage. Therefore, it goes without saying that individuals do not think or behave in inequality as if they were equal citizens in duties and rights. Inequality introduces social disorders which, in turn, serve to justify inequality. Anyone who examines in good faith the justifications for inequality in "Society" will indeed realize that they never rest on the Principles of social order but always on pretexts themselves based on the existence of money and monetary prejudices.

One last characteristic of money, which materializes the right of access to the market (or the ability to pay), is to limit the extent of this right to the number of units each person has. (This limitation applies to both individuals and all groups of individuals: businesses, states, administrations, organizations, associations, etc.). Now, the extent of the right of access, today proportional to wealth, determines, for both individuals and legal entities, not the real but the financial extent of what they can do. Thus, in a monetary system, human enterprises are constantly constrained, or even prevented, by budgetary issues. Therefore, money limits the potential of humanity itself. Moreover, it is worth noting that preventing some from buying products (or paying for services) that exist or could be manufactured forces others to limit their production, produce less, or even stop producing altogether. From a global perspective, money has catastrophic effects: on one hand, it often leads legal entities away from good decisions and generally makes them choose the worst or the least bad solutions, on the other hand, it limits job creation or destroys jobs. From an individual perspective, it forces people to think as individuals, so they consume as little as possible and only care about others to be jealous or disdainful, instead of thinking as citizens who would consume without fearing for their rights and consider that consuming itself amounts to providing work to their equals.

Citizens, these are the characteristics of money, the instrument through which the existence and power of Mony manifest themselves. Each of them, taken in isolation, already has inevitable and disastrous consequences. But, in

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

reality, all of them combine and create a multitude of terrible and insoluble problems. By shaping their environment in this way, an environment to which they must adapt, money offers men a particular vision of the world and of Man himself, a vision that they consider to be an eternal truth and from which money is paradoxically absent. In fact, money has been part of the scenery for so long that they no longer see it. They don't need to think about it; they think through it. Before being a material or real parameter, money is therefore a mental given, just like Mony. Incapable of questioning money, despite its tangible aspect and its visibly devastating effects, they are all the more unfit to question Mony, which has no reality except in their minds and whose existence they don't even suspect. So, even if they were audacious enough to abolish money or interfere with its natural functioning, they would not annihilate Mony, which would soon put them back in line.

But you, jurors citizens, you are no longer in that situation. You are no longer unconscious. Now, you know! You know that money is not nothing; that it is not neutral; that it has exclusively devastating effects at all levels, regardless of how men use it; that it must be purged from "Society" so that individuals finally become the Citizens they are supposed to be.

You also know that it is itself a consequence of Mony, that is, the belief that the concept of market value is necessary for exchange; that this belief, which places objects above humans by making the so-called equivalence of value between things the sole concern of exchanges, requires considering financial interests before those of humans, even often neglecting the latter, and prevents the conception and, even more so, the establishment of equality in Rights among Citizens, a fundamental Principle of social order; that Mony inevitably generates inequality in rights among individuals, synonymous with oppression, and destroys Society; that it is therefore inherently antisocial and tyrannical.

Finally, citizens, you know that Mony begets money, which is its support and whose use perpetuates Mony; that condemning Mony would require not only proscribing money but also replacing it with another means of exchange; that a possible condemnation of Mony would presuppose the intention to establish Equality; that Equality is desirable and possible, provided it is based not on the random will of men and efforts against nature, but on a new means of

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

exchange conveying and instilling in men a new conception of exchange and Society. You must therefore distinguish the means of exchange that is money from the very notion of a means of exchange and not hesitate to condemn Mony on the pretext that a means of exchange is obviously necessary and that Equality is allegedly impossible, for it is within our power to make it a reality.

Citizens, you have been called to judge Mony. Now is the time to fulfill your duty. For this extraordinary trial, unlike custom, we had to examine the facts before being able to draw up the indictment. At the end, the charges brought against Mony are as follows:

Establishment of the concept of market value, abstract, random, and without any social significance, as the basis of social relations;

Establishment of the concept of market value, abstract, random, and without any social significance, as the basis of social relations;

- Establishment of the concept of market value, abstract, arbitrary, and without any social significance, as the basis of social relationships;
- Substitution of an inhumane, individualistic, and antisocial logic, its logic, for the logic of LAW or political association;
- Destruction of Society by implosion or, at least, obstruction of men's will to constitute themselves into a true Society;
- Diversion of Society from its role — which is to ensure that Citizens fulfill their Duties towards it and to guarantee them in return the Rights of the Citizen — usurpation of this role, at least in its essential part, and transmission of this role to individuals or companies⁹⁰.
- Disassociation of rights from duties, especially between the Right to enjoy the benefits of the City and the Duty to participate in the life of the City;

⁹⁰ In clear terms, under the reign of Money, individuals only benefit from what "Society" produces to the extent that the exchanges they make bring them returns. It's up to each person to make the most of it. Enjoying the benefits of Society is no longer a right guaranteed to citizens by Society. Money strips Society of the role of guaranteeing this right to its citizens. Later, money, through which the right to access the market, and thus to enjoy the benefits of "Society," passes, gives individuals or businesses control over this right concerning individuals or employees whose income depends on them. The right to enjoy the benefits of "Society" is therefore no longer dependent on Society, nor even on personal efforts, but on the goodwill of some.

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

- Denaturation of the notions of Duty and Right;
- Major obstacle to Equality (both in Rights and Duties);
- "Desubstantiation" of the concept of Citizenship;
- Strong encouragement to individualism;
- Maintenance of men in a permanent state of rivalry, conflict, or war;
- Provision to men of a means of exchange with multiple uses or derivative effects — oppression, exploitation, corruption, spoliation, etc. — contrary to the social mission of a means of exchange;
- Introduction into the City of the "law" of the strongest, due to the materialization of the right to access the market, which makes it an object to pass, to take, to lose, to protect, to covet, etc.;
- Exacerbation of the need to Have and diversion of men from the necessity of Being;
- Artificial and unequal delimitation of rights, starting with the right to access the market;
- Arbitrary grant to a small minority of monstrous powers;
- Enslavement of workers;
- Keeping "Citizens" ignorant of their Rights, their Duties, the meaning of their Dignity, the Principles of social order, etc.;
- Annihilation of Freedom, reduction of all freedoms, falsification of all Rights;
- Imprisonment of Man in a vicious circle, both physically and morally;
- Incitement to legitimate but doomed revolts;
- Insidious monopolization of public debate;
- Official supplier of excuses for everything, even the unjustifiable, the worst being that men, prisoners of its logic, accept them as just;
- Dumping its guilt on men — with their own complicity — for the evils it generates;
- Systematization of theft;
- Impoverishment of "Society";
- Usurpation of the merits of Man;
- Obstruction to the deployment of human genius;
- Reduction of the powers of Man to do good;
- Permanent pressure on the decisions, acts, and lives of men;
- Creation of insoluble problems by its very existence;

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

- Aggravation of real problems by its artificial constraints;
- Systematic introduction of perverse and fatal effects into everything men can undertake that is noble, these enterprises often being reactions to its injustices and the aberrations it commands;
- Poisoning and alienation of minds;
- Incitement to bad faith, blindness, incoherence, I-don't-care-ism;
- Incitement to lying, corruption, crime, murder;
- Devaluation of human life, of life in general;
- Crime against Humanity and Nature;
- Exposure of nations and the world to chronic crises with disastrous consequences;
- Anachronism;
- Despotism;
- Tyranny.

At this probably non-exhaustive evocation, do you not hear, jurors citizens, Humanity cry out to Mony: guilty! guilty! All the good comes from Man, almost all the evil, from Mony. You can search; there is not a solid argument in its favor. Moreover, no one defends it, even if everyone accommodates it. Truly, it does not deserve our pity. It must be condemned without appeal. Now, what punishment could be more suitable for it than the one that seems to have been destined for it? Citizens, Humanity demands for Mony, in the name of Equality, the only punishment appropriate to its nature and the height of its crimes: the capital punishment.

Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, remember that you must be Citizens in conscience!

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

JURY QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIONS

Mr. Blind: Mr. Prosecutor, since we are allowed to intervene, allow me to point out that it would be better to talk about concrete things, about everyday problems that require urgent answers!.....	15
Mrs Hell : It is too easy, Mr. Prosecutor, to make Mony a scapegoat, to blame it for all the ills of the Earth!.....	16
Mrs. Shortsighted : But, Mr. Prosecutor, Mony is the means of exchange that humans need, you said so yourself!.....	18
Mr. Neuron: Mr. Accuser, it appears from what you're saying that Mony is a fate, that it is inevitable, therefore necessary and unavoidable!.....	24
Mr. Neuron: Mony is a means of exchange, perhaps of oppression, but it certainly is not an oppressor! It is a means for individuals who are solely guilty of its misuse! Mony is just a means!	30
Mr. Cupid: But nothing prevents people from not being so! Even without Mony, they would fight! Man is inherently evil!.....	41
Mrs. Weathervane: But how can men be equal when they are naturally different?.....	45
Mrs. Weathervane: Citizen accuser, you mentioned that Rights exist only within the City. But men have rights by their very essence as humans! "Men are born and remain free and equal in rights!"	48
Mr Blind: To counter the inequality generated by Money, it would suffice for the City to impose equal incomes! It is therefore people who do not want to be equal!.....	53
Mr. Neuron: But, Mr. Accuser, Mony allows assigning value to things! Without it, no values!.....	57
Mr. Blind: Alright, but how can we exchange without the notion of value?.....	62
Mr. Cupid: If citizens were equal, they would all have the same things!.....	65
Mr. Neuron: But if citizens were equal in rights regardless of their work, the arduous jobs would be deserted!.....	69
Mrs. Shortsighted: Mr. Accuser, you present Work as a Duty. But what would happen, in Equality, to a Citizen who is unemployed?.....	72
Mr Glutton: But why would Citizens work more if, being equal, they had nothing more to gain from it?.....	77
Mr Neuron : All of this is very nice, Mr. Accuser, but you make assertions without presenting any figures, without relying on a precise study, without providing economic or historical analysis... From the beginning, everything you say is just suppositions! Why, under these conditions, continue to listen to you?.....	82
Mr. Blind: Mr. Accuser, you mentioned that in Equality, the Right of access to the market would not be artificially limited, in other words, it would be limitless! In essence, Equality would make all Citizens wealthy! Doesn't this pose the risk of making them complacent or even suicidal?.....	87
Mr Neuron: But, Mr. Accuser, for the context of Man to change, for Equality to come about, Man must first change himself!.....	93
Mrs. Hell: The context matters, but Man is selfish, proud... Sin is within him! Mony responds to his temptation! Eliminating it would not remove sin from the heart of Man, and Mony would reappear sooner or later in another form.....	99
Mr Cupid: But won't men always want to be or have more than their neighbors? Even without Mony, Citizens would seek to trample each other and find ways to defraud one another!.....	104
Mr Blind: Nevertheless, Mister Accuser, without Mony, we wouldn't be where we are now! Mony is a factor of progress!.....	112
Mrs Hell: You demonize Mony!.....	115

INDICTMENT AGAINST MONY

Mrs. Shortsighted : Mr. Accuser, you haven't mentioned anything about underdeveloped countries, who are much worse off than we are! They should be our top priority!.....	124
Mr. Glutton: And nature? You seem to ignore, Mr. Accuser, the fact that Citizens, free to access the market, would consume and waste much more than today, so that all natural resources would not be enough to satisfy their appetite, and the impact of the City on the environment would be terrible. Capitalism causes havoc; the City would lead to catastrophe!.....	126
Mr Neuron: Nevertheless, Mr. Accuser, in the era of globalization, it is impossible to overthrow Mony. Countries are too economically interdependent for any one of them to unilaterally abandon currency.....	134

The bigger the lie, the more people believe it. The greater the truth, the more doubt it generates.